LIBRARY OF PRINCETON

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

http://www.archive.org/details/universalist01lond

THE

UNIVERSALIST.

VOL. I.

LONDON:
H. K. LEWIS, 15, GOWER STREET, NORTH.
NEW YORK: HALLOCK & LYON. BOSTON: T. WHITTEMORE.

1850.

LONDON :
PRINTED BY H. K. LEWIS,
GOWER STREET NORTH.

PREFACE.

We were once conversing with a pious member of the Church of England on the many lamentable causes and deplorable results of those sectarian distinctions which obtain among the professed followers of the Lamb. We deprecated those divisions of which denominational distinctions were the deliberate and public avowal; of which many were the result of a difference of opinion of the utmost, sometimes almost ludicrous insignificance, when compared with those momentous principles by which they both still professed to be actuated. But so it is; and here we have another illustration of the proverb, "they strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel."

Our church of England friend reciprocated our sentiment; and lamented, as we do, the narrowing influence thus exerted over the heart, an influence which is one of the first fruits of such divisions.

We were right in our conjecture, that the title of our magazine was a designation our worthy friend had never thought of in connection with religion and theology; and, when we frankly told him we were Universalists, he looked thoughtful and exclaimed, "I like that term!" Not that it conveyed to him all that we associate with it; but by it were suggested principles in which his Christian charity and generous spirit fully sympathized—principles which, in their proper development and final results, embody our highest aspirations, and confirm our most holy faith.

To maintain, on the one hand, that we are not the advocates of party —that our object is unsectarian; and to assert, on the other, a distinct individuality by the assumption of an appellative which must distinguish us from any and all ecclesiastical bodies, may appear somewhat paradoxical. We observe, and we are anxious to be understood, that since a magazine, such as that with whose interests we have the honor to be identified, must have a name to distinguish it from others of the same species, just as the writer must have a name to distinguish him

from other men, that name was adopted which should most honestly, and most accurately express or suggest the principles we designed to advocate. And, so far from proposing to ourselves another addition to those ecclesiastical bodies, of which, as such, the New Testament knows nothing whatever, and to which we believe the Scriptures to be opposed, we have been anxious, and take this opportunity seriously to protest, against any such design. And it is a satisfaction to us to know, that, among our contributors and subscribers, there are members of various communities—Christians of different denominations.

Our great object is sufficiently made known in the pages of the volume which we now have the pleasure to present to our readers. And we verily believe, that the errors which we oppose are as much the cause and fuel of those divisions which disgrace the Christian world, as the truths for which it is our privilege to contend are antagonistic to the spirit of sectarianism and party.

We do not say that all differences of opinion must vanish upon a reception of the doctrine of Universalism; but we do hold that, while those differences may, nay must be materially lessoned, they will not, because they will have no power to diminish that charity which, linked to the throne of the Eternal, embraces all into whom God has "breathed the breath of life."

If Universalists, however, because they are Universalists, are to be cast out of the synagogue, as has been the case in instances which have come to our knowledge, their opponents must not charge them with sectarianism, if they meet together for mutual edification, and the worship of the great Father of all.

We have been accused of the undignified procedure of giving "nicknames," because we have sometimes used the term "*Partialist*" in contradistinction to *Universalist*. We can sincerely say that we never intended any disrespect towards those from whom we differed; and that the use of the term has been resorted to as a simple matter of convenience; just as the designation we have given ourselves best expresses the sentiment which we advocate. It is the regular converse suggested by avowed opposition; and was in use, moreover, long before we adopted it.

We cannot allow this opportunity to pass without congratulating our friends and ourselves upon the present position and cheering prospects of *The Universalist*. Considering the fewness of those who openly defend Universalism—the difficulty of securing publicity for a new periodical,—the few facilities at our command for obtaining an extensive circulation—the opposition with which we have had to contend—our best wishes and largest expectations have been more than realized.

We thank our friends, one and all, for the support and sympathy, the kindly-tendered counsel and forbearance, which we have received at their hands. We thank God, and take courage.

No material alteration will be made in the conduct of *The Universalist*. A greater variety and wider range of subjects may be intoduced, and a more popular style of treatment may be desirable: these we will endeavour to secure.

We propose to commence, in our next volume, an examination, in as plain a style as possible, in order that the unlearned reader may have an opportunity of examining and deciding for himself, all the passages in the Old and New Testaments which are supposed to teach, or imply, the doctrine of eternal torments. The Universalist will thus constitute a complete dictionary on the subject.

Our undertaking would be materially assisted, and our principles more widely diffused, if those who have the means and the opportunity would order one or more copies of each number, in addition to the copy they require for themselves, for gratuitous distribution. Thanks to those who have hitherto kindly acted upon this suggestion.

London, Dec. 1850.

CONTENTS.

—o—

PAGE

Brief Sketch of the Recent Progress of Universalism. By the Rev. David Thom, D.D., Ph. D. 4
Cherubim, on the 196
CORRESPONDENCE.
Anecdotes against Universalism and the *Christian Witness* . . . 71
Granville Penn on 1 Tim. iii 15—17, by Dr. Thom 192
Judicial Oaths 47, 72
Mr. H. Clarke, the dismissed agent of the London City Mission—Meeting at Richmond 104
On the Establishment of the Universalist 23
Relly and his congregation, by Dr. Thom 24
On Acts xii. 4 168
On proclaiming Universalism to the World—reply to *Dr. Thom's objection*, by Anetazo 284
Query by Amor Veritatis 212
——Reply to, by Veritas Amoris and Anetazo 235
Rev. Ridley Herschell and the Exhibition of 1851 260
Scott's Commentary 143
The Word καταεργεται 104
"The Heresy of Universalism," by W. C. Boardman 120
——Remarks on by Censor, and L. F. J. 144
The authorized translation of the Scriptures 142
"Telling Anecdotes"—by Nohdorn 211
The origin of the doctrine of Hell Torments 259
Christian Precepts the Mirror of God's Character 244
Dark side of the Gospel 222
Dealings of God with mankind: cotemporaneous, successive, and final . 13
Doctrine of Endless Misery in the church of England 268
Dr. Tholuck and the prospectus of *the Universalist* 249
Duration of the Universe 145
Election and Universal Salvation 204
English Universalist's Reading Society, Octagon, Plymouth . . . 118
Eternal Torments and the Constitution of Man 185
Examination of Blomfield's Notes on Rom. v. 25
———— of Luke xx. 27—38 11
Explanation of the terms and phrases supposed to express the place or punishment of Endless Torment in the next life 169
EXTRACTS.
Bishop Newton's Writings 151
Dr Phillip Nicholas Shuttleworth 71
Edward Cock's "Man and his Maker" 70, 80
John Foster's Life and Correspondence 27, 101
Lyell's Visit to the United States 177
Sir J. Stephen's Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography 9
Southey's Life of Wesley 186
Figurative Language of Scripture 199
Corn or Grain 240
The Sabbath 219
First Principles 206
How they propagate liberal doctrines in Italy 210
Is faith, or believing, essential to Salvation? 184
Jean Frederic Oberlin's Glimpse of Universal Salvation 119
Jeremiah White 77, 193, 237
London Thieves and City Mission 224

Miscellanea 156, 187
Natural Religion 210
Observations submitted to the Consideration of Partialists . . . 16
On being Wise above what is Written 270
On 1 Cor. xv. 24—28 121
On 1 John ii. 2 155
On Matthew v. 44, 45 167
On Matthew xvi. 9 250
On the Hebrew and Greek Words translated "Curse" 148
On the Words Αἰὼν and Αἰώνιος 49
Paddle-Box 128
Paul a Heretic 208
Phraseology of Scripture 19
Poetry
A Word to the Elect, By Acton Bell 135
By a Universalist 82
By Alfred Tennyson 271
From Southey 70
On Matthew xviii. 21 157
Peace as a River 211
The Voiceless Voice, By George Hopeall 82
The Saviour's Love, By Alfred Olifant 157
What is it? By A. C. Thomas 247
Professor Stuart's Difficulties 153
Questions well asked 209
Reviews.
Albertus Magnus' treatise [1193—1280] 190
All prophecy fulfilled 191
Divine Inversion. By David Thom, D.D. Ph.D. 188
Dr. Thom and his Works. The Number and Names of the Apocalyptic Beasts 65
Exposition of the Ninth Chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans. By James Morrison 167
Ireland as I saw it. By W. S. Balch 226, 250
Sacramental Religion subversive of Vital Christianity. By the Rev. W. Brock 283
Shem, Ham, and Japheth. By Peter Hately Waddell . . . 139
The Soul: her Sorrows and her Aspirations. By Francis William Newman 39, 58, 83
The Great Redemption: an Essay on the Mediatorial System. By William Leask 46
The Doctrine of a Future State. By William Gibson Humphrey, B.D. 141
The Millennium. By George Galloway. 271
The Ultimate Manifestation of God to the World. By David Waldie 161
Three Questions Proposed and Answered. By David Thom, D.D., Ph.D. 135
Religion and Insanity 207
Rule of Criticism 250
Scripture Parallelism 55
Second Coming of Christ, and the Resurrection of the Dead . . 106
Summary of "An Inquiry into the Nature, Progress, and End of Prophecy." By Samuel Lee, D.D. 20, 34, 113
Thoughts for the Thoughtful 67
The Scriptures turned upside down by Modern Limitarians . . . 98
The Tree known by its Fruits 23
Trinity, on the 180
True Christianity a Practical Religion . . . 52, 125, 171, 213, 261
Universalism the Comforter 208
Was St. Paul a Universalist? 248
What is Universalism? 1

THE UNIVERSALIST.

WHAT IS UNIVERSALISM?

It is the simple unquestioning belief of the ancient truth, that "the tender mercies" of God "are over all His works;" that "He willeth not that any should perish;" that "He will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth."

The Universalism we believe and advocate is just this, and nothing more than this. We are sure of this one truth, each for himself, that God loves *me;* we are equally sure that if he loves *me* he loves *thee*, reader, whoever thou art, and whatever men call thee; and equally sure that He loves *him*, our neighbour, and so forward and backward, and on every side, widening the circle till all are embraced—all that live and move—that act and suffer.

The proof I have within me, of which no dogma, no anathema can deprive me, that God loves *me*, is the proof I have that He loves *every* ME.

And, oh! how the soul leaps forth to meet this truth! How it is soothed and softened, humbled and gladdened; how all its ailments are medicined, its perversity exposed and shamed out of it; how it is expanded and enlarged by this truth! How it is raised by it above the vexations and littlenesses of all kinds of this world! What an influence this belief has, when it is firm, to reconcile men to each other and to the present state of things!

Here again we are simple autobiographers; and in this way we judge, that, if this belief does so much that is holy and godlike for us, it does the same for others; and then the reason why others are not affected in this way is, that they have never heard this doctrine; or, if they have, do not in fact believe it.

No: of the millions who have heard it few really believe it. The great majority believe it "*in a certain way*"—"*in a sense*"—but not simply. Divines have puzzled themselves to invent names for the different kinds of God's love: names which we will not name, because every one knows them. But, in a straightforward, childlike way, nobody believes that God really loves *all* and loves them all *alike*.

We, then, who are desirous of speaking to our fellow men under this title, believe simply and unquestioningly, and with all our hearts, that "the love

wherewith God has loved us," is undistinguishing. We build on this declaration, that "there is no respect of persons" with God. And we take a distinctive appellation; because we hold, that this truth, this one glorious truth which shall yet renew the world, has not been fully either preached or believed. If it has been stated in one breath, it has been contradicted in the next. Mankind has never had the comfort of it. Men have not known it, because they have never *seen* it—never intelligibly heard it. "The gospel" which they have heard has been too much a system of "conservatism," or world-love, of patching up the old (and also the present) system of things, and dovetailing this old system somehow into the Bible. And what confusion and bewilderment is the result! A real system of divinity, a regular orthodox folio of it, is a wonder of perversity and tortuosity. And certainly to master it is to "labour for that which is not bread," as many of us know to our cost—*cost* in many ways. Nor is the divinity of the pulpit any better: perhaps it is worse, for there is less consistency in it. And the divinity of the people is really an awful medley; as not only our literature, and our table-talk, but, alas! as our lives everywhere testify.

Well: this old patchwork system, this compound of heathenism, and Judaism, and Christianity, is worn out. It has been tried and found wanting. It has not strength to convert the heathen, nor to overthrow the world; nor fully to transform the heart. The folios won't let it do this. The pulpits, like "the Hall," won't have men cured, except *secundum artem*. They would rather see them die.

Now, if this last sentence should seem to you uncharitable, call to mind all you know of the history of "the healing art," and just think what it was really that lay at the root of all the religious persecutions you are acquainted with; whether the brutal persecutions of former days, or the refined of our own.

Did you ever ask yourself, reader, whether orthodoxy may not be a "fashion of this world" which "passeth away?" Certainly it is a very different thing in different places; and it has been very different in different ages, as every one knows. And, it strikes us, that it will be very different still, before it is the "*doxy*" of a renewed and Christian world.

Not that it is an indifferent matter what men believe; though we think men have had a little too much to do with even that. But there is a great difference between Christian belief and orthodoxy. For what is orthodoxy in the Church of England, according to the received acceptation of the word? It is not belief of the three Creeds, nor subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, nor assent to the book of Common Prayer, but—*a fashion*: a fashion which assuredly passeth away.

A man may stumble at the Articles and not be a worse Christian for that; as *all* acknowledge, even of those who subscribe to them. And a man may believe some articles of the three Creeds unscriptural, and still be a true Christian; as all but Papists and Tractarians confess. And he may believe much wrong in the Anglican Prayer-book and lose nothing as a believer in Christ; as all but Tractarians admit: nay, as many of *them* admit.

But if he is not *orthodox*, though all differ about what is meant by it, he is condemned by all.

And the orthodoxy of dissenting Christians we imagine to be much the same sort of thing,—"varium et mutabile semper."

Now what is the *real* aim of the Pulpit? Is it not to advance this phantom, orthodoxy? The heathen perish for lack of knowledge, our population actually outgrows our religion and our knowledge, and a great part of it is totally ignorant of Christ; yet the pulpits are quiet, dignified and orderly, all striving after orthodoxy.* Is it not so? Then is it too much to say that the pulpits would rather see men die than see them saved apart from orthodoxy?

But this is a wide field to which we will return hereafter. All we say at present is this, the church of Christ — the *visible* church that is — composed of all those churches which believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, has exhibited power, and knowledge, and zeal; but it has never yet exhibited LOVE. And this is what we believe the world to be waiting for. And because we believe the religion of our Lord to be a religion of *love*—and that when the spirit of love pervades the Church, and the Pulpits teach *love* and not Orthodoxy—and men are taught that God loves them, not that he created them to be damned according to orthodoxy—then men will believe and be saved, and not till then—because we believe this, and have some right earnest thoughts of our own about it, we have resolved to say something to our fellow Christians of every name, and especially to our fellow sinners of every grade; as many as will hear us, of what is passing in our minds, as week by week, and day by day, we listen, and speak, and read, and observe, in this Christian land of ours.

It seems to us, too, that we are approaching a new state of things, and we are looking for the time of which our Lord prophesied in His prayer, (for His prayers are all prophecies), "that they *all may be one*, as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: *that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.*" Orthodoxy separates Christians and hardens unbelievers. It defeats itself besides; for the more it is insisted on, the less it prevails. We think, then, it is not orthodoxy, but *love*, which is wanted to make men think the same things, and be of one mind, and adopt one language.

Man will not be coerced into faith; indeed he could not be coerced into Heaven; and therefore He, who knew what was in him, came to win him by *love*. But His church has always overlooked this, and consequently has been always divided, always persecuting, always worldly. It has so overlooked it, that numbers have come to deny it on system; and the folios have agreed to banish altogether the great truth that God *really*, and *effectually*, loves all men.

But better days we trust are at hand; and, as the glorious period above referred to, is to be brought about by human instrumentality, we would gladly have a share in so holy a work. Therefore we write. We do not undervalue a correct belief, but we think it has been overvalued. It has occupied the place which belongs to LOVE. We will try, as we can, to remedy this.

NOHDÖRN.

* The Church of Scotland, itself notoriously Socinian a century ago, suspended Dr. Thom, of Liverpool, whose learning and piety are well known in our own country and many others; because he believed the love of God in Christ Jesus was not limited by the General Assembly!

A BRIEF SKETCH OF THE RECENT PROGRESS OF UNIVERSALISM.

By DAVID THOM, D.D., Ph.D.

To write the history of the rise and progress of the doctrine of Universal Salvation, as it ought to be written, would require greater talents and attainments, than the author of this hasty abstract is conscious of possessing; and a larger space than can be allotted to the subject in the columns of this periodical. It would embrace a period of at least 1600 years extending from the time of Origen to the present day. And it would exact the notice and consideration of differences almost as great and as numerous, indeed almost as startling, as are known to exist in any other department of theology.

Fortunately such a dissertation as that just indicated is not absolutely required. Popular accounts of Universalism are in existence. Besides hints in reference to the subject which are to be gathered from the pages of Evans, Bellamy, and Hurd, two histories, having it for their object to trace Universalism from its origin till our own times, have, for the last twenty years, been in circulation in the United States of America. I allude to "The Ancient History of Universalism," and "The Modern History of Universalism," by Ballou and Whittemore respectively. The latter is brought down to the year 1829.* Both are necessarily popular in their structure and details; and, in spite of the acknowledged talents, consummate industry, and strict fidelity of their authors, are in some respects imperfect. They possess, however, much merit. Persons desirous to possess them may accomplish their object, either through Mr. Lewis, the publisher of this magazine, or by direct application to Mr. Abel Tompkins, Bookseller, Cornhill, Boston, Massachusetts.

Without travelling farther back, it may be permitted me to take a rapid and cursory glance at the state of Universalism in Great Britain, and the United States of America, (omitting Germany for want of room,) during the last 80 or 90 years.

James Relly, originally a friend and follower of the celebrated Whitfield, was, within the period just named, the first who gave an impetus to universalist doctrines. He flourished somewhere between 1760 and 1783. The scenes of his operations were principally London and the immediate vicinity. Laborious with his tongue and pen, and exemplifying the power of religion in his own person, his influence was considerable. Rellyan Universalism, as it has been called, has the system of Calvin for its basis. A work of Mr. Relly's entitled "Union, or a treatise on the consanguinity and affinity between Christ and his Church," is that by which he is best known. It has been more than once republished in America and this country.

One of the converts of Relly was a man more distinguished than himself. I mean the able, excellent, and indefatigable John Murray. He, likewise, had originally been a disciple of Whitfield. Circumstances having compelled him to emigrate to America, he landed on its shores in 1770; and there, for

* A new edition of this work, with the necessary additions, is expected soon to make its appearance.

the first time, on any thing like a large scale, was proclaimed by him the doctrine of God's universal love. New-Jersey was the scene of his first exploits. Potter and his friends originated the movement. Few at first supported him; and the opposition which he had to encounter was great and harrassing. The sacred flame, however, spread. As individuals became convinced, they threw themselves, and the weight of their influence into the cause. Murray's devotedness, ability, knowledge of Scripture, experimental godliness, fervid eloquence, courage, and disinterestedness of character, more and more drew attention to himself and his glorious subject. Converts became numerous. Societies sprang up in every direction. Conventions of universalists were organized; and, long before the death of that eminent man, and apostle of the Abrahamic gospel, (which took place in 1815,) Universalism in America had diffused itself to an extent, had acquired a consolidation and importance, and had come to possess among its supporters, an amount of talent, energy, and influence, calculated to give it a high standing among the religious denominations of the great transatlantic republic.*

To track minutely the progress of universalist doctrine in the United States of America, however interesting in many respects it would be, is somewhat beside our present purpose. Our limited space, even were it otherwise desirable, positively forbids it. Passing over the controversy between Chauncy and Edwards, Jun., 1782—1789, and various other matters, suffice it to say, that what the labours of Murray began, the zeal and energy of Elhanan Winchester contributed to carry on. The accession of this great man to the cause took place in 1781. About 1790, commenced that change in the character of American Universalism, which lovers of the simple gospel must ever deplore; and which, to the great majority of American professors, has proved so agreeable. Murray was, and continued to the last to be, a most decided Calvinist in all his leading religious views. The sentiments of Winchester, originally Calvinistic, latterly tended to Arminianism. Hosea Ballou, who had been brought up among the Baptists and is still alive, was led, about the period last named, to make an assault upon the Deity of our Lord, the necessity and efficacy of his atoning sacrifice, and kindred Scriptural doctrines. His views, for which no doubt preparation had been made by the theology and success of Winchester, were rapidly and greedily embraced. The pride of human reason which they flattered, and the spurious liberality which they tended to promote, rendered them acceptable to man's fleshly mind. *Facilis descensus averni.* Downwards quickly was the progress. Unitarianism, reaching even to a desire to court alliance with those who reject it, is now one of the leading features of American Universalism. Hence the utter impossibility of evangelically-minded men, in this country, to whom the universal love of God to man is dear, forming any connexion, or having any fellowship with those parties in the United States, who profess to cherish a similar view.—Farther particulars as to the sentiments of American universalists may be collected from the writings of Hosea Ballou, Thomas Whittemore, I. D. Williamson, Streeter, Chapin, Wm. S. Balch, Walter Balfour, (I wish that I could honestly except this worthy man

* See John Murray's most interesting Auto-biography, edited by Thomas Whittemore.

from the charge of Unitarianism,) and others. The fifth of the "Dialogues on Universal Salvation," written by the author of this, will be found to communicate, in a condensed form, some farther information regarding transatlantic Universalism.

The name of Elhanan Winchester, mentioned in the last paragraph, brings me back to England, with the progress of Universalism in which his labours and success will ever be associated.

Concerning the state of matters after the death of Relly, not much is known.* In 1787, Mr. Winchester came from America to this country, to revive the flagging cause. His eloquence, his transparent candour and child-likeness of manner, his courtesy, and the amazing ability displayed by him in the statement and enforcement of his views, commanded attention, and procured him numerous followers. Unhesitatingly, also, did he plunge into controversy. His "Dialogues on Universal Restoration," simple, pointed, and elegant, as well as displaying no small degree of critical and argumentative skill, soon gave him a highly respectable standing in theological literature. Marked was the encomium pronounced on this work of his by the "Critical Review," for September, 1788. His able reply to an attack made on him by Mr. Dan Taylor,† shewed him to be a most dexterous master in the art of fence. Nor was his advocacy confined to the doctrine of Universal Salvation. Prophecy in subserviency to Universalism, as appears by his four volumes of Lectures, delivered at Glasshouse Yard, Southwark, 1789, had attracted no small share of his notice. On Mr. Winchester's return to America, in 1794, he left the cause of Universalism, so far at least as the Metropolis was concerned, in a somewhat flourishing condition.

What followed, as painful in its nature, I should have liked to pass over, if possible, in silence. A few words, however, must be said. The retrograde tendencies of Arminianism speedily developed themselves. Able and humanly speaking upright as I believe William Vidler, Mr. Winchester's successor, to have been, the abandonment, on his part, of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, and the substitution for them of sentiments more consonant to the fleshly mind of man, were attended with the usual results. Universalism either merged in the dead sea of Unitarianism, or wore itself out. The labours of Scarlet and Creighton, and of Rait, Coward, and Jeffreys, among Rellyan Universalists, were insufficient to arrest the downward current. Between 1820 and 1830, Universalism, in the Metropolis, as the characteristic of a distinct denomination, became extinct.

Somewhat lax and accomodating do the sentiments of Elhanan Winchester appear to me to have been. Besides, Universalism was with him, as it is with too many others, not a part merely, but almost exclusively the whole of *the counsel of God*. It seems, in the minds of English, as in those of American Universalists, to have absorbed every other topic. Election, the church of God, the enjoyment of the Kingdom by the spiritual Israel, and the subserviency of the mediatorial reign to the final result, were doctrines first shoved

* See a few facts, as to a Society formed in London, in 1778, by Messrs. Cue, Clegg, &c., in Vidler's "Sketch of Winchester's Life." London 1797.

† Mr. Winchester's Pamphlet was entitled, "Restitution of all things Defended."

into the background, and then formally denied. Hence, not the Christianity so much as the Universalism of the individual, (a Universalism often extending no farther than a desire to believe universalist doctrines to be true,) was in the religious associations of the body, the point inquired after. May scripturally minded universalists, in time to come, take a lesson from the past; and, while the ultimate manifestation of God as all in all, and the ultimate application of the atoning sacrifice of Christ and the power of his resurrection to all, is to them inexpressably dear, because revealed,—may they be on their guard against neglecting or perverting any portion of God's word; and ascribing privileges to an unregenerate world, which belong solely and exclusively to the people of God.

Notwithstanding the defection from divine truth which was going on in London, as well as in Wisbeach, Birmingham, Chatham, and other places in England, God left not himself without a witness in our island. Besides private individuals here and there, it pleased our heavenly Father to enlighten one, in North Britain, eminently qualified and disposed for public labours. The late Neil Douglas is the party to whom I now allude. Educated and called to the ministry in connection with a body of Presbyterian Dissenters, known as the "Synod of Relief," (relief from patronage), he was, for many years, one of its pulpit ornaments. He was also remarkable, throughout life, for personal piety. About the beginning of this century (1801), having been convinced of God's universal love on evangelical principles, Mr. Douglas began proclaiming it in the town of Greenock. There he was, for a season, eminently successful. From Greenock he removed to Glasgow; and, in that large, enterprising, and opulent city, he continued to be the able and efficient pastor of a congregation of Universalists, as well as to compose works in favour of his glorious theme, until his death in 1823. Mr. William Worrall, succeeded to his labours and success. Fever having cut off that zealous and talented man, in 1828, circumstances of a distressing nature occurred, under which the cause of Universalism in Scotland is still suffering. However, a few universalists, lovers of the Lord Jesus, have, all along and amidst many discouragements, clung to their faith in their own and the world's salvation. Christie, Harvey, Calder and others have helped to keep up the sacred flame. The Lord revive his work among them in the midst of the days! George Galloway, of Glasgow, as the author of many able tracts in favour of Universal Salvation, and James Nicol, Cumnock, author of one most interesting pamphlet, must not be passed over in silence.

Johnstone, Dunfermline, Paisley, Ayr, Falkirk, and some other Scotch towns, besides Greenock have, at different periods, witnessed the temporary existence of small Universalist societies. These, however, must be numbered at present among the things that have been. Let us hope that such men as Fraser and Clark may yet be induced to put forth their energies in behalf of this glorious cause.

The labours of Purves, in Edinburgh, between 1771 and 1795, I pass over, as having been directed more to the establishment of Unitarianism, than of spiritual Christianity.

The doctrine of endless torments is now, to say the least of it, becoming doubtful in the minds of many of the piously-minded Scotch. Unfortunately,

however, for some of these, White and Dobney's notion of the future and everlasting destruction of the unregenerate, has had greater attractions than the more scriptural doctrine of Christ's being the destroyer of death, as well as of sin. They have not been enabled to observe, that, as sin, is swallowed up in Christ's death, so is death in Christ's resurrection. They have thus not been enabled to apply the revealed fact of our Lord's deity, and consequently of his righteousness and life being divine, to the destruction, not only of sin, but of death, both works of the devil, and both mere affections of the creature.—1 John iii. 8. Mr. William Glen Moncrieff, a minister of Musselburgh, is, in his "Dialogues," as well as in other writings, the talented although mistaken advocate of the annihilation of the wicked.

As to the present condition of England and Ireland, in regard to Universalism, it is with some diffidence, owing to his own connection with the subject, that the writer of this ventures to speak. On the other side of the channel, Mr. Richard Roe, while in Dublin; Miss Hobbes, now residing in Waterford; and John Hamilton Esq., of St. Ernan's, County Donegal, have published works in support of the doctrine of a world's salvation. Mr. Seabrook, formerly of Plymouth; Mr. Thomas C. Cowan, once at Bristol, now resident at Reading; Major Fawcett, Brighton; Mr. Kent; Mr. Waldie; Mrs. Morgan, Bradford, Wilts; Mr. James, Mr. J. N. Bond, Mr. Oakshott, Mr. Wapshare, and several others,* have endeavoured, each in his own way, and all upon somewhat varying principles, within the last few years, to illustrate the unlimitedness of the divine love, through Christ Jesus. Who has not seen Mrs. Sherwood's admirable suggestions in behalf of this doctrine, in her "Monk of Cimiés," and the fourth part of "Henry Milner?" (1837). The glowing and magnificent language of Bailey's "Festus" must be familiar to every reader of taste and discernment. The author of this has also thrown in his mite. Having, in 1826, (June,) been satisfied, that everlasting torments necessarily involve the everlasting existence of sin,—a dogma repugnant to God's word, as not only subverting the efficacy of Christ's atoning sacrifice, but making our blessed Lord the confirmer for ever of one of the works of the devil,—and having had, in 1829, imparted to him the additional conviction of the twofold work of Christ in dying and rising again, implying a twofold result in regard to man, namely destruction and new creation, or, in other words, having been convinced that it is through the power of Christ's resurrection in new-creating, and thereby in causing the old-creation to pass away, 2 Cor. v. 17, Gal. ii. 20, and Rev. xxi 5. that the application of the work of Christ is progressively carried on, he has felt no hesitation whatever in proclaiming his views from the pulpit and the press. A few Christian friends in Liverpool agree with him.

Throughout the British dominions, both in the Established Church and among Dissenters, evangelical universalists exist. To afford such parties a medium of mutual communication, to serve as a point round which they may rally, and to stimulate their exertions in behalf of truth, the present periodical has been undertaken.

Liverpool, 1849.

---

* As Mr. Upjohn, formerly of Shaftesbury, Wilts.

Extract from "Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography." By The Right Hon. Sir James Stephen, K.C.B. 2 vols. *Longmans.*

These Essays originally appeared as articles in the Edinburgh Review, and the following extract is made from the author's "Epilogue," now first published, in which he avows, without reserve, "opinions," which had been "rather suggested or assumed, than explicitly stated, in the preceding pages." We make it as showing, in forcible and convincing language, that the doctrine, to which it is opposed, though admitted in theory, is generally disbelieved in practice; and therefore is a suitable preparative to our own more direct and satisfactory proofs of its falsehood.

"The doctrine of the eternity of the future retribution forms no *necessary* substratum of any other Christian doctrine. If it could be completely disproved, its disappearance would not dissolve, nor apparently impair, the strength of any other part of that mighty fabric. Every argument, every narrative, every expostulation, every warning in the Bible, would be as complete and intelligible, if not as emphatical, without it as with it. The same thing cannot be said of any other of the main truths revealed in the Holy Scriptures. Each of them is an integral part of the system to which it belongs. Is it then, probable, that a doctrine, which, if true, infinitely outweighs, in importance all the rest of the articles of our creeds, should have been propounded as a mere isolated truth standing in no necessary connection with the rest? Is it not far more probable, that there is an error in that construction of our Saviour's words, which would render him the promulgator of it?

"The angel who descended from heaven and proclaimed to the shepherds the incarnation of the Redeemer, announced himself as the herald 'of good tidings of great joy which should be to all people.' But if it be indeed true, that He who was thus made incarnate, proclaimed an eternity of unutterable woe to the vast majority of those, who, from generation to generation, throng our streets, our marts and our churches, how shall we reconcile the angelic announcement with this awful proclamation? The Gospel is, indeed, intelligence of blessedness, to 'the *few* who are chosen;' but the same Gospel is, on the popular hypothesis, not less intelligence of wretchedness, surpassing imagination, to 'the *many* who are called.' Is not, therefore, the accuracy of that hypothesis involved in much improbability?

"The Bible teaches us, that Christ came into the world to bruise the serpent's head, to destroy the works of the devil, and to establish the kingdom of God; and Christ himself declared that 'He saw Satan like lightning fall from Heaven.' Is it reasonable to accept any construction of the other words of Christ, which would seem to ascribe to the Spirit of Evil an eternal triumph over the Spirit of Good, in the persons of the vast majority of the race whom he lived and died to redeem?

"In our present life, trouble, pain, and sorrow, are indeed, thickly sown. But they exist among us as anomalies, not as laws,—as the medicinal and remedial provisions which the Creative wisdom has infused into this economy of things, not as the ultimate end contemplated by that wisdom. In this

world, 'nothing terminates on evil;' although, in this world, evil so unhappily abounds. Do not, therefore, all the analogies of the Divine government raise a strong presumption against that interpretation of our Saviour's discourse, which represents him as foretelling a future economy of things, in which evil, not remedial but penal, not transient but eternal, is to be the doom of the vast majority of the children of Adam?

"Throughout the Holy Scriptures, a constant appeal is made to those moral sentiments, which God himself has implanted in our nature. Our heavenly Father has graciously condescended every where to point out to us the sacred harmony between His law as revealed by prophets and evangelists, and His law as written by himself on our hearts; and from that harmony we are taught to draw the best and highest proof of the inspiration of those sacred writings. Deeply conscious with what profound reverence it behoves us to apply that test of truth to any opinion deduced by the Church at large from Holy Scripture, we may yet venture to inquire whether it could be successfully applied in the case under consideration? If the words ascribed to our Saviour are not inexorably bound down to the construction they usually receive, by the absolutely inflexible force of the text and of the context, is it not most reasonable to adopt some other construction, to which our own natural sense of justice and equity can respond as clearly as it responds to all the rest of the inspired canon?

"So inveterate is the corruption of the human heart that, in the judgment of some, the infliction and announcement of no penalty less than that of eternal misery would be sufficient to turn it aside from present sinfulness. But does the dread of that terrific penalty really stem the headlong current of iniquity? Is it really productive of any corresponding alarm? Does it produce an alarm equal to that which would have been excited by the announcement of a penalty of infinitely less amount, but definite and intelligible? Does the world—does the Church—do her ministers—do her saints—really believe this part of the language of our Redeemer in that sense in which they familiarly interpret it? Is any human mind so constituted as to bear the incumbent weight of so fearful a probability of evil so utterly beyond the reach of exaggeration? Is the texture of any human body vigorous enough to sustain the throes of so agonizing an anticipation? What means the whole course and system of life which is passing hourly before our eyes, and through which we are ourselves passing? Why have our preachers time to engage in study, to harmonize the periods of their sermons, to give heed to our wretched ecclesiastical disputes, to devote one superfluous instant to food, to repose, or to occupy themselves with any other thing than the proclamation of the horrors of the approaching calamity, and the only way of escape from it? Let any honest man fairly propose to himself, and fairly answer the question, whether the unutterable disparity between his actual interest in all the frivolities of life, and his professed belief in an eternity of woe, impending probably over himself, but certainly over the vast majority of the human race, does not convict him of professing to believe more than he actually believes? And, if so, is there not some reason to doubt whether he has not erred in attributing to his Saviour a meaning, for which, after all, he cannot find any real place in his own mind, or any vital influence on his own heart?" Vol. II. p. 492—496.

AN EXAMINATION OF LUKE XX. 27—38,

INCLUDING REMARKS ON A RECENT TRACT, BY JOHN HOWARD HINTON, M.A., ON THAT PASSAGE.

THE word ἀναστασις, translated *resurrection*, is commonly supposed to denote a reunion of soul and body; but this is neither the proper meaning of the word, nor the doctrine denied by the Sadducees. The word, says Campbell, "denotes simply being raised from inactivity to action, or from obscurity to eminence, or a return to such a state after an interruption;" and "it is notorious," as he further remarks, "not only from Josephus, and other Jewish writers, but from what is said, Acts xxviii. 8, that they denied the existence of angels, and all separate spirits." He therefore, for "no resurrection," substitutes "no future life," as "the only version which makes our Lord's argument appear pertinent, and levelled against the doctrine he wanted to refute. In the common version, they are said to deny the resurrection, that is, that the soul and body shall hereafter be reunited; and our Lord brings an argument to prove—What? not that they shall be reunited (to this it has not even the most distant relation), but that the soul survives the body, and subsists after the body is dissolved. This many would have admitted, who denied the resurrection. Yet so evidently did it strike at the root of the scheme of the Sadducees, that they were silenced; and, to the conviction of their hearers, refuted."—Campbell on Matt. xxii. 23.

This answer of our Lord to the Sadducees is, at the same time, opposed to every species of Partialism. It not only refutes the doctrine of annihilation, by asserting the immortality of the whole human race; but also that of posthumous suffering, by asserting it to be a happy immortality. The common opinion limits our Lord's answer to the future state of the righteous; the expressions καταξιοθεντες . . τυχειν, ισαγγελοι, and υἱοι του Θεου, being thought inconsistent with any other; but it is obvious that the answer, in this case, would not embrace the whole question, which relates to all the dead indiscriminately. The supposed inconsistency must therefore be unfounded. An able tract has been written on this passage by John Howard Hinton, M.A., in which the phrases are all examined. To my apprehension, he proves more than he intends: that is, more than the future life of all, independent of its happiness or misery. I shall therefore avail myself of his explanations, as finding much in them to my purpose, both where they have and have not my concurrence.

He shows, in the first place, that the translation "accounted worthy to obtain," does not give the sense of the original, which is nothing more than to *enter on*, or *possess*; and this whether each word is used alone or both together. "Such redundancy of expression," he says, "is not without example in Greek writers; and an instance of it is cited by Schleusner, under the word καταξιοω."

His remaining explanations are as follow.

"Equal unto the angels: ισαγγελοι." This word would be better rendered, according to all authorities, 'similar to angels;' or as it is happily phrased by Mr. Isaac Taylor, 'on a par with angels.'* The point of similarity intended

* Saturday Evening.—Endless Life.

by its use is always to be suggested and determined by the connection. In this case, it is only that they will 'neither marry nor be given in marriage,' since "they cannot die any more;" and it involves no inconsistency to say, that even wicked men will, in the future world, resemble angels in *these* respects. Our Lord's words convey no more.

"The expression is varied a little by Matthew, who says, that in the future life, men are 'as the angels of God in heaven.' This phrase, of course, defines the holy angels; but it does not entail the idea of a resemblance to them in their holiness. The similarity is confined to the points already indicated."—p. 16.

If it does not entail the idea of a resemblance to them in their holiness, the definition "of God" must be superfluous; and tend only to embarrass the subject by the introduction of irrelevant matter.

Mr. Hinton admits that the phrase "the children of God: *υἱοι του Θεου*," is often used in the New Testament to denote a state of spiritual privilege, and that, by association, it more naturally conveys to us this idea than any other." It occurs in but five other places,—Matt. v. 9, Rom. viii. 14,19, ix. 26, Gal. iii. 26,—in *all* of which it is used in a good sense. There is indeed a "danger which lurks under such associations;" but it is danger to the cause of Partialism. I do not consider the phrases "children of God," and "offspring of God" as "equivalent." The latter, no doubt, expresses "our natural relation to God as our Creator;" but the former, in all other places, and in none more than the present connection, expresses a *spiritual* relation. All the dead are called the children of God in virtue of their resurrection through Christ, who is the "resurrection and the life;" "for, as in Adam all die, even so in Christ all shall be made alive." Christ, in his assumed humanity, is the head and restorer of our whole race; so that, without Christ, there would be no resurrection at all. It is vain, therefore, to give a detached explanation of this last phrase; and, when so detached, to say, "It denotes nothing of character."

Mr. Hinton has done good service, by showing the true meaning of the phrase *καταξιοθεντες . . . τυχειν*, as being the *only* one which apparently favours a limited view of our Lord's words." All the others do not furnish the least foundation for the same objection; though Mr. Hinton, on this supposition, thinks it necessary to pare them down to a neutral sense. Why should our Lord use language so much fuller than was necessary to silence the Sadducees, if not to state the facts of the case? Surely that explanation, which accounts for it, is preferable to that which nullifies it. It is indeed remarkable, that the two strongest expressions.—"the children of God," and "living to God,"—elsewhere restricted to the righteous, have here a "universal application;" teaching that all men are partakers with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in redemption from sin and death. For this reason, I consider this passage as pre-eminently teaching this great and glorious truth; and that nothing but the prevalence of an inverted system of interpretation prevents any one from perceiving it.

R. R.

ON THE DEALINGS OF GOD WITH MANKIND: COTEMPORANEOUS, SUCCESSIVE, AND FINAL.

The popular creed teaches, that all the inhabitants of the earth,—both living and previously dead,—both infants and adults,—all, as some say, in heaven and hell, or, as others say, in some sort of elysium or tartarus, in which their endless happiness or misery is either begun or anticipated,—are to be brought together and judged according to their works; though the Scriptures assert, that salvation by works, or even by faith without the gift of God, is impossible.—Gal. iii. 21, Eph. ii. 8, 9. Such a judgment moreover could be of no practical use to communities supposed to pass into an unalterable state of good or evil. It is indeed often said, that, "for aught we know, the example of endless suffering may be necessary to keep the saints from falling." According to this conjecture, even the saints in heaven are not perfected in that love, which casteth out fear; (1 John iv. 18) and, as the damned are thought to be a vast majority, evil is much more extensively and firmly established than good. This catastrophe, according to Calvinism, was appointed from the beginning by "a horrible decree;" and according to Arminianism, the Almighty desired, but was unable, to prevent it. The one represents him as cruel; the other, as weak.

I pass therefore from these nonentities to what appears to me the Scriptural scheme.

Conditional dispensations, as I conceive, were appointed to teach the absolute dependence of man on his Creator for all things, both here and hereafter, by showing him his natural inability, under the most favourable circumstances, either for the avoiding of evil, or for the acceptance or retention of good. Man was thus placed for trial under law, with its appropriate sanctions of reward and punishment; and, as every trial and retribution according to works could only serve as an index of power to obey given or not given, the inability of man was, in either case, equally proved. Law indeed was not equally given to all men; but, as human nature is the same in all times and places, it was given *sufficiently* for the specified purpose. Thus the law delivered to Moses was never given to the Gentiles, and the word or law of faith (Deut. xxx. 12, 13, Rom. x. 6, 8) was not preached to the Gentiles till after its rejection by the Jews. (Acts xi. 19—21, xiii. 46, xvii. 30, 31, xviii. 6, xxii. 18—21, xxviii. 23—38) When therefore the purpose, for which conditional dispensations were appointed, was *sufficiently* effected, they were brought to an end by the great final decision; (Matt. xxv. 31—46) and the truth thus practically taught, recorded for the instruction of all future generations. Be it however remembered, that this decision was limited to those nations which had heard the gospel; while the rest remained in that unremoved ignorance, at which God had "winked," and which we may conclude he still regarded with the same lenity.

Not that the world has been ever left wholly without law; for, though the law of a conditional dispensation has been abolished, there are nevertheless other laws, which have subsisted from the beginning. Believers are influenced

by love as displayed in a revelation of love; and the mass of mankind are restrained partly by the laws of society and partly by the law of conscience, which either accuses or excuses them. (Rom. ii. 14, 15.) Owing however to various circumstances, and chiefly to the prejudices of education, the decisions of the latter are, for the most part, erroneous and injurious. (John xvi. 2; Acts xxvi. 9—11.)

We know nothing of God or of his purposes, except by the revelation he has given us. He is self-existent; the Creator of all other beings, animate and inanimate; and the sole independent agent in the universe. Hence the actions of individuals are the necessary consequences of their constitution, and the circumstances in which they are placed; and, being such, have, in themselves or abstracted from law, neither merit nor demerit. I have already stated the purposes for which law, both instituted and natural, external and internal, were given; but, as the operation of these laws is confined to the present life, what, it may be asked, (and it is of all questions the most interesting,) is the final destiny of man? *God*, says the apostle John, *is* LOVE, thus emphatically declaring love to constitute, as it were, his *moral essence;* love, which, even among men, and in its least degree, "worketh no ill." (1 John iv. 8, Rom. xiii. 10.) This has so forcibly impressed the minds of many good and able men, that they have inferred from it the future happiness of all sensitive beings. The cases, however, are not parallel. Man, as made in the image of God, is his peculiar "offspring." (Acts xvii. 28.) Man, even by nature, is endowed with a *capacity* for receiving ideas of the Supreme Being, and of a futnre state of existence; which constitutes an *essential difference* between him and even the most intelligent of the inferior animals, as even heathen writers have noticed. "Ex tot generibus, nullum est animal, præter hominem, quod habet notitiam aliquam Dei."—Cicero de Legibus, Lib. I. Of all the animal tribes, there is none but man, that has any notion of God.

——————— separat hoc nos
A grege mutorum, atque ideo venerabili soli
Sortile ingenium, divinorumque capaees.—JUV. SAT. XV.

——————— this separates
Our higher nature from the speechless herd,
That to us men alone is given a mind
Sublimely capable of thoughts divine.

Man's higher nature indicates his higher designation; otherwise that nature, in a majority of instances, would have been given in vain. Admitting this restriction, it may again be asked, What is the final destiny of man? "If," says Professor Bush, "we were called on to specify any form of alledged Christian doctrine, for which the *least* amount of evidence could be adduced from the Scriptures, it would be that of *the final universal salvation of the race*. . . . We are utterly at fault in seeing anything *in the nature of the case*, which should be a satisfactory ground for the belief. As *moral character* must necessarily be the basis of *destiny*, we recognise no provision made, either in revelation or reason, for the change, whether at death or after death, by which a bad man can be made a good man, and as such be rendered capable

of happiness."—Anastasis, p. 329. This is Arminianism. The *will* of God is the basis of destiny, and the *work* of God is the source of moral character. This will and work have, from the beginning, transformed bad men into good; and I see nothing, *in the nature of the case*, to restrict this transformation to the present life. For myself, I rather think it leads to the contrary inference. After reading of Paul's instantaneous change from a bad man to a good by the glorious appearance of Jesus, I find no difficulty in conceiving how the same change may be effected by a transition to celestial glories. In short, the destiny of man seems to be wholly irrespective both of his knowledge and actions. God, if he had so pleased, could have given a saving knowledge of himself to every individual of our race; but he has conferred this privilege on a very small minority, even in countries nominally Christian. All have received injury, whether knowing it or not, through Adam; and all will receive benefit, whether knowing it or not, through Christ. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ all shall be made alive."—1 Cor. xv. 22. How degrading it is to Christ to make him, as Calvinism does, the head of a smaller family than Adam; or the medium of less good than Adam of evil! If however any part of the human race are to be endlessly tormented or annihilated, it must have been so decreed before they were called into existence. "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world."—Acts xv. 8. The errors of Calvinists and Arminians consist in each adopting seemingly opposite passages as leading principles; but the systems so formed betray their own deficiency by inability to stand alone. Each is obliged, by partial admissions, to lean for support on the other. Universalism alone reconciles all seeming contradictions, and thus alone embraces the whole truth.

Any one admitted principle, fairly applied, often is, or ought to be, sufficient to decide a controversy; by showing that the premises, from which any different conclusion is drawn, must be mistaken, and the conclusion necessarily wrong. Of such principles, in the present case, the following is all-comprehensive. There is no self-contrariety in God: "he cannot deny himself." (2 Tim. ii. 13.) But he is made to deny himself by that doctrine which opposes his power to his moral attributes: to his wisdom, by devoting intelligences capable of good to the dominion of evil; to his veracity, by breach of promise, or by nullifying declarations equivalent to promises; (Gen xii. 3, John i. 29, 1 Tim. iv. 10) to his justice, by a Pharoah-like requisition of the end without the means; and to his love and mercy, by visiting impotence with endless punishment. (Exod. v. 18, John vi. 44.) We may therefore assuredly believe, however time, place, or manner, may be hidden from us, that the Divine attraction, (without which none can come to Christ,) will influence every member of the human family. Let Transubstantiation and Partialism be therefore assigned to deservedly reprobated companionship: the one as a physical, and the other as a moral impossibility.

R. R.

OBSERVATIONS SUBMITTED TO THE CONSIDERATION OF PARTIALISTS.

However true it may be, that one positive declaration, or one unmistakable intimation of a less direct character, in what we do not doubt to be the word of God, ought to be as convincing to our minds of the truth of that which is declared or intimated as a thousand; still, it is highly satisfactory to find that the blessed truths of the Gospel are not only *abundantly* declared in the New Testament, but that, while they are so,—and that, too, more minutely and circumstantially as to detail than in the Old,—they are also not only conveyed in the latter more obscurely, through the medium of types and shadows, but declared positively, in language as direct and express, as that which is used in the former.

No one will deny that salvation, or blessedness in Christ, is distinctly spoken of in the New Testament, with regard to *extent* as well as to *mode*; or that it is to the *extent* thereof that the terms "all," "every," "the world," "the whole world," are applied, when they occur in passages in which this (salvation or blessedness in Christ) is spoken of; or that these terms are as expressive of universality as any that could be used.

No one will deny, then, that the *extent* of salvation or blessedness in Christ is spoken of, in the New Testament, in terms as expressive of universality as any that could be used.

While then the advocates of those two human systems of Theology, which are conventionally styled "General" and "Particular Redemption," or "Arminianism" and "High Calvinism," set themselves to *explain away*, by the use of human reason, the plain, simple, natural, and obvious meaning of the passages, in which the extent of salvation or blessedness in Christ is thus spoken of, (the one class in one way, and the other in another, so as to suit their respective creeds) it cannot but be highly satisfactory to any, who, regardlessly of early and long held prejudices, of attachment to human systems of Theology, and also of the frowns of those with whom they may have been associated in matters of religion, are willing, however late in life, or in their Christian experience, to submit their opinions candidly and unreservedly to the test of Scripture, and to take their creed from the pages of inspiration treated in a simple childlike spirit, and consequently to admit the universality therein declared of salvation or blessedness in Christ—to such it cannot but be highly satisfactory to find that, though this salvation or blessedness in Christ is spoken of more minutely and circumstantially, as to mode, and perhaps other matters connected therewith, in the New Testament, it is, with regard to extent spoken of, in the Old no less distinctly, no less positively, no less declaratorily, in terms equally expressive of universality, as those which are found in the New: in fact, so far as *our version* is concerned, in the very same terms.

I will confine myself at present to the promise made to Abraham in the first communication (so far as we know) that the Lord made to him, recorded in Gen. xii. 1—3; and with reference thereto, I submit the following observations.

Those who are bold enough to deny that Abraham understood, and rightly

understood, that the blessedness promised in the communication to him from God, recorded in Gen. xii. 3, "in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed," was an *universal* blessedness, must (unless such denial is made in mere slavish subservience to a human system of Theology, and in utter disregard of principle and consistency,) make one or other of the following assumptions, for none of which (it is believed) can the slightest warrant be adduced.

That Abraham *previously* to this (as far as we know the *first*) communication to him from God, understood the doctrine of election and the distinction between the elect and the non-elect.

Or that, as used and understood at the time, the word "all" signified *some*, or *many*; the word "families" *elect families*; or the expression "all families" *some*, or *many out of* all families.

Or that the Lord (whether intentionally, or unintentionally,) *misled* Abraham as to his meaning, by the terms in which he expressed himself.

For, except upon the supposition of one or otherof the above cases being the truth, (and the assumption of any of them would appear to be a most flagrant instance of a determination to defend a system by any the most unworthy means, rather than give it up,) nothing can be clearer than that Abraham understood, and rightly understood, the blessedness promised to be *universal.*

Those who, while they admit the universality of the blessedness promised, contend that it is a blessedness as to *temporal* things only, *not* a *spiritual* blessedness, are contradicting Peter and Paul: of whom the former, with the said promise, associates the *spiritual* blessedness of being *turned away from iniquities*; and the latter, not only associates therewith the spiritual blessedness of being justified through faith, but terms the delivery thereof preaching the Gospel. (See Acts iii. 25, 26, and Gal. iii. 8.).

The blessedness promised in Gen. xii. 3. is then (it is submitted) both an *universal* and a *spiritual* blessedness: in fact, *universal salvation.*

Those who admit the universality of the blessedness promised in Gen. xii. 3, and who also admit it to be a spiritual blessedness, not a blessedness as to temporal things only, but contend that the blessedness consists merely in an *opportunity* of *being saved*, upon certain conditions—in *salvability*—in being placed in a *salvable state*, not in salvation itself, as a sure infallible thing—must, to be at all consistent, make one or other of the following assumptions; none of which, it is submitted, is at all in accordance with the truth of the Bible.

That man can be saved at death without previously undergoing that change, which our Lord calls being born again.

That man can regenerate himself, or that one man can regenerate another.

That God regenerates all mankind in this time state.

That God regenerates, or is inducible to regenerate, in this time state, men whom he did not, before time, purpose to regenerate in this time state.

That God did, before time, purpose to regenerate *all* mankind in this time state, though he does not do so.

To these parties, the following propositions are submitted.

No one can be saved at death, without having been born again, or regenerated, in this life.

Man cannot regenerate himself, nor can one man regenerate another.

Regeneration is God's work.

In the act of regeneration, (as distinct from anything in the subsequent life and conduct of the regenerate peson) there is, on the part of man, no cooperation with God; but he is therein altogether passive.

Regeneration then is the work of God, exclusively.

There is no successiveness of purpose with God.

God does not do anything suddenly, or unpremeditatedly, or without a previous purpose relating thereto.

God does not do anything in *time*, without a *before time* purpose relating thereto.

God does not do anything in time in opposition to, or otherwise than in accordance with, such before time purpose relating thereto.

God then does not regenerate nor is inducible by conduct, or prayer, or by anything else in the creature, or by any other consideration, to regenerate, in this life, any whom he did not, before time, purpose to regenerate in this life.

In consistency with this, it may be observed,—God does not regenerate on account of anything *spiritually* good in the creature before regeneration; the fact being, that regeneration is the origin and first commencement of anything spiritually good in the creature; nor does he regenerate on account of anything *morally* without being spiritually good in the creature; nor indeed on account of anything, but the before time purpose of his sovereign will.

God is omnipotent in matters of grace, as well as of providence; in regeneration, as well as in creation.

God is unchangeable with regard to his purposes of grace.

Being unchangeable with regard to his purposes of grace, and omnipotent in carrying them out, it cannot be true that God, before time, purposed to regenerate in this life, any whom he does not regenerate in this life.

God does not regenerate *all* in this life.

God then did not, before time, purpose to regenerate *all* in this life; but, on the contrary,—as he does nothing in time otherwise than in accordance with his before time purpose,—purposed before time to leave to die, and to take hence in their unregenerate state, all those whom he *does* take hence in their unregenerate state.

Seeing then, that, as there is no salvation at death without previous regeneration in this life; neither is there such a thing as salvability, or the opportunity of being saved at death, irrespective of previous regeneration in this life; and seeing that man cannot regenerate himself, and that regeneration is exclusively God's work; and that he does not regenerate all mankind in this life; nor regenerates, nor is inducible to regenerate, any one in this life whom he did not, before time, purpose to regenerate in this life;—the theory that all mankind are in a salvable state, that is to say, may be saved *at death* or have the opportunity of being so, must be a mere delusion.

The universal salvation, then, or blessedness in Christ, which is spoken of in the Bible, must be not contingent, and uncertain, but certain and infallible;

to be accomplished in the Lord's own time, whatever objections thereto may present themselves to our poor imperfect minds, and however certain passages in the word of God may (when examined superficially, and without regard to the context and to the analogy of scripture) *appear* to be against it.

I. N. B.

ON THE PHRASEOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE.

As we live in material bodies, and in the midst of a material world, the only way in which we can form any conception of mental or spiritual things, is by using words, originally associated with ideas of material objects, in a representative or figurative sense, according to some real or supposed analogy between these objects and their unseen archetypes. Thus, the word *spirit*, which we apply to all living living immaterial beings, including God himself, is from the Latin *spiro* to blow or breathe. Revelation and creation appear to be adapted to each other, by the great Author of both, for this purpose; and hence the former employs a multitude of figures, otherwise called types, shadows, similitudes, or symbols, the right knowledge of which is of essential importance. There are typical persons, things, times, places, and actions or events; and where one does not sufficiently describe all the properties of a spiritual object, many are employed for this purpose. Thus, Christ is typified by a lamb, a lion, a tree of life, manna, &c. The state of immortality and happiness is symbolized by a paradise, a land of promise, an inheritance, a city, &c. According to this statement, all misinterpretation consists in not distinguishing between the literal and figurative sense; or, when they are distinguished, in mistaking the true sense of each.

There is another branch of this subject, which demands attention: that is, the diversity of expression employed, to designate things considered as real, or according to strict metaphysical truth, or as only apparent, or according to common apprehension. Thus, when God says of himself, "I change not," (Mal. iii. 6) the expression is literally true, and reveals to us an essential attribute of the divine nature; but when he is said to "repent" (Gen. vi. 6, 7) the language signifies, not any change in his mind, but only in his dealings with men. And so, in all cases, in which human actions, passions, or bodily members, are ascribed to God the language is figurative. Thus also, when it is said "the way of man is not of himself," that "it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps," (Jer. x. 23) we are truly informed of our natural dependence and impotence; and hence when called to "avoid evil and do good," (1 Pet. iii. 11) the language is necessarily human, or adapted to human infirmity. So we learn from Paul. "I speak (*ανθρωπινον*) after the manner of men, because of the infirmity of your flesh: for as ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness." (Rom. vi. 19.) Strictly speaking,

however, the ability is not in man; and hence the prayer of the prophet, "Turn thou us, O Jehovah, and we shall be turned." Lam. v. 21.

Lastly, even in physics, or the phenomena of nature, it has not been sufficiently noticed when the language is descriptive of facts or of sensible appearances.

"The things which Scripture uses as figures of other things are taken, 1. From the natural creation, or world of sensible objects. 2. From the institutions of the law. 3. From the persons of the prophets and holy men of old time. 4. From the history of the church. 5. From the actions of inspired men, which, in many instances, were not only miracles, but *signs* of something beyond themselves, and conformable to the general plan of our salvation and redemption." Jones's Works, Vol. IV. p. 31.

Besides this, a correction of mistranslations is often necessary. There are indeed some words and phrases, the mistranslation of which is extensively injurious to the sense and consistency of Scripture.

R. R.

SUMMARY OF "AN INQUIRY INTO THE NATURE, PROGRESS, AND END OF PROPHECY, in Three Books. I. On the Covenants. II. An Exposition of the Visions of the Prophet Daniel. III. An Exposition of the Revelation of St. John. To which is prefixed a Preface and Introduction, in Three Parts. By SAMUEL LEE, D.D, late Regius Professor of Hebrew, and formerly Sir Thomas Adams's Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge; D.D. of the University of Halle; Canon of Bristol; Rector of Barley, Herts, &c. London: *Seeley, Fleet Street.* 1849."

DR. LEE's Enquiry into the Nature, Progress, and End of Prophecy, is a work that must command the attention of every student of prophecy. It is a work of learning, scriptural research, and enlightened piety. Having perused its pages with deep interest, and received great instruction therefrom, we desire to give a condensed analysis of the same, for the benefit of those who may not have the opportunity and advantage of consulting the work itself; as well as earnestly to recommend its study to those who may be able to command such an advantage.

The work is divided into three books. The first is on the Covenants, the second on the Prophecies of Daniel, and the third on those of St. John, with a preface and introduction. The present divided and uncertain opinions entertained on the subject of prophecy, Dr. Lee attributes to the tendency there is in the doctrine of resemblances to mislead. The affairs of this world being subject to invariable laws, its inhabitants everywhere the same, a similar conduct necessarily produces similar results; and renders prediction, under such circumstances, very liable to be easily mistaken and misapplied. One of those laws occasions all things to take their rise in small beginnings. Thus the nations and empires of the world have their rise and fall; the individual characters of the same, making up the aggregate of their fame and disgrace. Another of those laws is manifested in necessity, producing industry, thriftiness, economy, out of which wealth, influence and power result; and these again occasion luxury, indolence, and those thousand ills which terminate in poverty, weakness, disagreements, and dissolution. During these vicissitudes, various characters appear on the page of history; during its wars, heroes; during peace, lawyers, poets, statesmen, acting more or less on principles of expediency, produce confusion of opinion and conduct, that requires but little of ingenuity

to trace a resemblance to a prophetic prediction. Thus the Church, at no age of its existence, has been without its supposed antichrist: and, what is more, so long as this system of interpretation continues, the more plausible and ingenious the writer, the more sure he is of superseding his less exciting and clever predecessor. Thus many live to witness the failure of their predictions; and all are hereby reduced to deplore the uncertainty of the once sure word of prophecy.

These writers invariably urge onwards the period of fulfilment, and are ever predicting something more glorious, for this earth, than that heavenly and spiritual Christianity established by the apostles. These Judaizing principles produce Judaizing results, obscuring the letter of sacred scripture, and destroying the evidence of its truth. The popular pre-eminence given to the restoration of the Jews to the land of Canaan, may be numbered among the notions that are injurious to Christianity; add to which the confident daily prediction of the nearness of this glorious period. Every political event that occurs is, if capable of an ingenious interpretation favourable to these notions, seized upon as indicating the nearness of this glorious period; and thus unconsciously and insidiously, the Christian finds himself, by listening to these fables, that he has learned to walk by sight instead of by faith in the things spiritual and invisible. Let us sift all this, and examine the principles and practices of Mr. Mede, which are those adopted by all this class of writers on prophecy.

Preface and Introduction.

Part I.—On the Principles of Prophetical Interpretation adopted by Mr. Mede and his followers.

Mr. Mede's principle is fully developed when he tells us, in interpretating the seals,—"The first prophecy of the seals comprehends the destinies of the empire. The other, Rev. x. 9, 10, of the little book, the destinies of the Church, or of the Christian religion, until at length both shall be united in the church reigning, &c." This mere expression of opinion, he supports by referring to Daniel's digest of the destiny of the world and the Jewish church; nor, adds Mr. Mede, does the event cross it. The admission of all this in no way is sufficient to convince us that it ought to be received as a sound principle of interpretation, For it still remains a question, whether the revelations made to the apostle John are a series of new predictions, as in the case of Daniel, or whether they are not rather a synopsis and system of interpretation of Daniel's predictions, with reference to the establishment of the Christian church? Indeed it cannot, in these days, be too frequently inculcated on the attention of students of prophecy, that it contains nothing beyond the everlasting covenant made with Abraham, in whom all nations are to be blessed (Comp. Gen. xvii. and Gal. iii.) By this Scripture, we learn that the promises were made to Abraham's seed, who is Christ. Again it is written, "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy;" but nowhere in scripture is the notion, that these predictions indicate certain political events, supported. Mr. Mede, in common with all his followers, falls into the very common mistake of supposing that the present time and the future time, spoken of in sacred scripture, are their own present and future time. Their minds may discover a resemblance; but, to arrive at a sound view of the prophecies, they must learn to discriminate between resemblance and identity.

Part II.—On the Principles of Prophetical Interpretation propounded in the works of Dr. Todd.

Dr. Todd's works were first printed in Dublin, 1840, entitled "Discourses on Prophecy;" and, 1846, "Six Discourses on the Prophecies relating to Antichrist."

"The *literal* sense of sacred scripture," says Dr. Todd, "is commonly defined to be that signification of the words which the author intended, and which his cotemporaries, in the ordinary use of language, would have understood. The *spiritual* sense is that interpretation which supposes the things

designated by the literal sense to denote other things not immediately signified by words." Dr. Lee on this remarks, this latter definition is either faulty or useless. For if the *literal* signification is taken to be that which the author intended according to the first definition, then, as things *spiritual* might have been intended, the term *literal* here, can have no signification different from the spiritual. Dr. Todd's literal sense does not exclude metaphor; such as the light of knowledge, the fury of the tempest. He also observes that *grammatical* meaning is not *literal* signification. His real meaning is probably the strictly *natural* sense of words: nevertheless his definition is involved in obscurity and confusion. It is presumed that difference in application is what he is contending for, with those whom he considers his opponents.

The same want of accuracy of observation is noticed on his remarks on Dan. ii. He considers the arguments employed to support the explanation that the empires succeeding the Babylonian to be the Persian, Greek, and Roman, to rest on very weak foundations. His first objection is a palpable misapplication of v. 41, viz. *the kingdom shall be divided*, which he makes to rest on the fact of the image having its toes composed of iron and clay, which he says denotes that the division of the kingdom, or the kings who are to preside, shall not cleave to one another. Intimating the division into ten, which is palpably wrong. Daniel's words are "As *the toes* were *part of iron and part of clay*, &c., *the kingdom* (i. e. when divided) *shall be partly strong and partly weak* (i. e. it shall consist of *two* irreconcileable parts, or rather sorts of characters). Daniel does not say *the kingdoms* but *the kingdom* under this division shall be in this condition; nor does he say the toes shall nor cleave to one another, but the iron and clay of which they are composed shall not. It is true he virtually makes these toes to represent ten kings; but then it is not necessary nor indeed, intimated by the terms used, but quite the contrary, that the division mentioned should be extended to them severally.

Again, before taking final leave of Dr. Todd and his literal and spiritual canon, we have, in John vi. 49, 50, two different senses: a literal and spiritual one. *Your fathers did eat manna...and are dead. This is the bread...that a man may eat thereof and not die.* Sacred Scripture will not submit to our definitions.

Part III.—On the principles of interpretation adopted in the following work.

Dr. Lee follows his own Hebrew Grammar and Soloman Glassius's Rhetoric, whose work, he says, stands to the present day unrivalled. He determines on making Scripture its own interpreter The Revelation he pronounces to be a reveletion indeed of the drift and scope of perhaps every prophecy in the Old Testament, and of Christ in each and every of these. A concatenation and interweaving of prediction and event, spreading itself over the whole surface of the divine word.

In noticing the opinions and usages of the early fathers as to prophecy, he mentions Eusebius, who makes Christ *coming in the clouds of heaven* to indicate his divinity and the eternity of his kingdom. Eusebius was defective in not seeing that the fulness of the gentiles had come in; and in looking, like many of us, for something better and more magnificent than the grace and the truth brought by the Lord Jesus, and established in the earth by the ministry of the apostles. A question of degree and of taste—but prophecy speaks positively and with authority; and the mean of its fulfilment rests in divine power. When it was fulfilled, its voice ceased to be uttered; and when it expired, miracles also ceased. This fact ought to outweigh every sort of argument founded on degree or resting on taste.

Dr. Lee animadverts and is greatly surprised, that the Bishop of London should have advocated the popular notion of the carnal restoration of the Jews in a recently published sermon: an opinion as destitute of any scriptural foundation as of truth; and which has a darkening effect on the interpretation of the Old, as well as of the New Testament No one, he adds, can look through the tomes of the *Critici Sacri*; the *Synopsis* of Poole, the *Scholia* of the younger

Rosenmuller, the publications of Gesenius, Ewald, and Hengstenberg, and even of the enlightened Vitringa and others, without feeling the gloom impenetrable. All, he adds, has been elegance, ingenuity, and some learning; but the theology of sacred Scripture has been little regarded, and less understood.

PAROIKOS.

(*To be continued.*)

THE TREE KNOWN BY ITS FRUITS.

The influence of a man's belief is manifest in his life, according to its character, and in proportion to its intensity. We are well aware that the doctrine of eternal torments is calculated to exert a mighty influence over the conduct of the individual in whose faith it exists as a *reality*. But is that influence healthy? Does it fortify Christian principle? Does it lead to greater conformity to the divine image? Is it promotive of happiness?

"The tree is known by its fruits." The doctrine of eternal torments is not a tree of life: it is the *upas*, of whose fruits the following is a specimen. A waiter* in one of the London Club houses, who had long sustained a most excellent character, was recently placed at the bar, before the magistrate at the Lambeth police court, on the charge of having wilfully murdered his own daughter, aged sixteen months, by drowning her in a water butt. After the commission of the dreadful act, the unhappy father gave himself into the hands of justice; at the same time acknowledging the deed. On being upbraided for his inhumanity, he replied, "I did it to save its soul." To the surgeon who was called in, he made a similar observation; expressing his conviction that he was "eternally damned;" and stated that he had been reading "*religious books*" at the club, which fully confirmed his views on the subject. And so, to insure the salvation of his beloved child,—of whom it appears he was exceedingly fond,—he destroyed it; thereby imagining that he had secured its escape from the *risk* of eternal damnation; to which it would become liable by living a few years longer in this world of temptation and sin!

Unfortunately this is not the first instance of the kind; and were the doctrine which, in the case of this unhappy individual, produced such deplorable results, realized as a fact by those who hold it only as a part of their formal creed, instances of a like description would, doubtless, be of more frequent occurrence.

This affectionate but misguided father believed in the salvation of infants: a true and consoling faith. But why are infants saved? Not *because* they never sinned; for, though they never sinned, they share in the consequences of sin: not because they are personally worthy; for they are as incapable of a righteous as of an unrighteous action. Infants are saved, like the rest of Adam's descendents, *by grace;* through the righteousness of the second Adam, which has abounded unto "*the many*" who die by the first. Had he known and believed this revealed truth, he would have spared his child; and, instead of yielding to despair, and regarding himself as "eternally damned," would have been rejoicing in Him, who is "the Saviour of all men, especially of those who believe."

CORRESPONDENCE.

The following Reflections, extracted from the private Letter of a Correspondent, are so well entitled to a place in our periodical, that we have been induced to transfer them to its pages.

Sir,—I have received a prospectus of the intended periodical, "The Universalist." * * * * *

The matter is not merely one of the chief importance; but it is the very chief.

* The Case is reported in the Times of September 22nd, 1849.

Upon it hinges all our love to *God* and to *man*. Either I love my neighbour as myself, or I do not. If I do so, then can I love, in the real sense of "love," that *Almighty*, who I think will save me; but will not save some (if it were only one) of those whom I love as myself. It is a mere contradiction in terms to say, I should love such one; for, if I do, I do not love him, whom I suppose that Almighty may fail to save, as I love myself: and, if I confess that I do not love my neighbour as I love myself, it is plain I dare not call myself a Christian.

I have many years held the doctrine of ultimate universal salvation; being driven out of mere so-called orthodoxy to this divine reality, by the necessity of the case. I did not know that the idea had ever been presented to other minds. It was in solitude, with my Bible and my God, that I was led to it; and since that time I constantly see how little of that glorious divine truth I have yet realized, how little of its privileges I have enjoyed. It opens the door to *immensity* of love, joy, peace, and hope.

One of the surest tests of the real universality of any man's views, will always be the absence of the *bitterness* of controversy. He *knows* that his opponent is to be convinced, and shall be so. He dares to love him, though as yet in deep and God-dishonouring error; while the man, who holds the limited doctrine, dares not love me if he could, so long as I hold and maintain what he maintains to be damnable error. For then he might fix his love on one whose lot was hopeless, who was to be abandoned of God, and carried into endless captivity from among God's creatures, out of the reach of God's mercies, by Satan, by God's enemy,—and how could he ever be happy, if he loved such a one as this?

To those who are engaged in this work, the words have a full meaning which say "Be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord; forasmuch as ye KNOW, that your labour is not in vain in the Lord." In his name, I am yours,

Ireland, Dec. 7, 1849.

To the Editor of the Universalist.

Sir.—I am exceedingly annoyed at the great scantiness of materials, respecting Mr. Relly, and the fate of his congregation in London, which I have been able to procure.

Vidler, in his "Memoir of Winchester," 1797, says not a word about either Relly or his followers, although at the time when he wrote, a body of persons holding Relly's sentiments was in existence in London; and in the "Modern History of Universalism," a very few lines suffice to convey all the information, extremely meagre, of which I am at present possessed. Mr. Bell was officiating to the remnant of Rellyan universalists, in 1828. Nothing in regard to them, since this time, do I know.

Mr. Rait, who seems to have been their pastor for about forty years, died in 1817.

Are any of your readers able to furnish me, or, what would be far better, is any of them competent and disposed to send to you, for insertion in your columns, a brief and distinct history of Rellyan Universalism in London, from its commencement to its extinction? If not, can any of them point to sources whence full information may be obtained? To me, and I suspect to many others, an account of Mr. Relly's congregation would be especially interesting.

I am, Sir,

Your very obedient Servant,

Liverpool, Dec. 14, 1849. D. THOM.

THE UNIVERSALIST.

EXAMINATION OF BISHOP BLOOMFIELD'S NOTES ON ROMANS V.

Bishop Bloomfield gives a view of this chapter, which would be correct, if not marred by a heterogeneous parenthesis, inserted with the unavailing expectation of reconciling contrary principles. This will appear by repeating said parenthesis as required by the concluding parallel, and thus defeating him with his own weapon.

"To advert to the contents of this chapter, it is," he observes, "shown, that being thus justified, 1. We have peace with God (with whom we were before in a state of enmity, being alienated from him), and we enjoy, through Christ, free access to a state of favour with God, and thus are led to rejoice in the hope of future glory, v. 1, 2. 2. We are supported and comforted in all our afflictions during the present life; nay, we may even rejoice in them as the instruments of spiritual good to us. v. 3—5. 3. All this good is rendered certain, and the hope of it ensured by the fact, that Christ, having died for us while in a state of enmity and alienation, and having thus reconciled us to God, will not fail to perfect the work which he has thus begun, v. 6—10. 4. We may now rejoice in God (who is as truly *our* covenant God as he had been that of the Jews), on account of the reconciliation which Christ has effected, v. 11." So far very well. "5. This state of reconciliation with, or filial relation to God, is now extended to all men (i. e. proffered to all, laid open to all, rendered accessible to all), in like manner as the evils occasioned by the sin of our first parent have extended to all, v. 12—14." (i. e. been proffered to all, laid open to all, rendered accessible to all); "yea, such is the greatness of Christ's redemption, that the blessings procured by his death far exceed the evils occasioned by the sin of Adam, v. 15—19; they even exceed all the evils consequent upon the sins of men, who live under the light of revelation, v. 20, 21."

On this I observe—1. That "extended" and "proffered" are not equivalent, the one expressing a certain, and the other an uncertain result. 2. That the parallel, "in like manner" &c. requires (as now

shown) a repetition of the parenthesis, "i. e. proffered to all," &c. But is this true? No—These evils are actually and really extended to all; and the opposite blessings, though proffered, are not merely proffered, but, to realize the parallel, must sooner or later, here or hereafter, be made equally certain to all. In short, his statement involves the absurdity of uncertain blessings exceeding certain and inevitable evils.

"19. This verse is explanatory of the preceding, and οἱ πολλοι should be rendered '*the* many,' which, as appears from the foregoing, is equivalent to παντες: the main drift of the Apostle throughout this passage being to *set forth the universality* of the redemption, as being *coextensive* with the evil introduced at the fall, which it was designed to remedy. So Dr. Bentley, in his masterly sermon on Popery, after quoting what is said at v. 12, and the *redditio* at v. 15, remarks: 'Who would not wish, that our Translators had kept the Articles in the version, which they saw in the original? Thus, "If through the offence of the one (that is Adam) *the* many *have died*, much more the grace of God, by the one *man*, *Jesus Christ*, *hath abounded unto the* many.' By this accurate version, some hurtful mistakes about partial redemption, and absolute reprobation, had been happily prevented. Our English readers had then seen, what several of the Fathers saw and testified, that οἱ πολλοι the *many*, in antithesis to *the one*, are equivalent to παντες, *all*, in v. 12, and comprehended the whole multitude, the entire species of mankind, exclusive only of *the one*. So again, v. 18, 19, our Translators have repeated the like mistake; where, when the Apostle has said, that 'as the offence of one was upon all men (εις παντας ανθρωπους) to condemnation, so the righteousness of one was upon all men to justification;' 'for,' adds he, 'as by *the one* man's disobedience (του ἑνος) *the many* (οἱ πολλοι) were made sinners, so by the obedience of *the one* (του ἑνος) the many (οἱ πολλοι) shall be made righteous.' By *this* version the reader is admonished and guided to remark, that the many in v. 19, are the same as παντες, all, in v. 18."

This, however, is followed by the usual limitation, supported by the usual subterfuge.

"It is not, however, to be understood as meant, that all mankind are *actually* 'made righteous'; but only that the benefit of this δωρημα, or χαρισμα, or δικαιωσις ζωης, is *held out to all;* and ,if they do not reap the benefit of it, it is through their own fault."—

But how does this agree with *his own* explanation of ch. viii. 23?—"for the world (i. e. God's creatures) was made subject to imperfection, corruption, and consequent misery, (not by any will of its own (i. e. not as a punishment for any voluntary demerits of the sufferers); but by Him who thus subjected it, yet with a hope [on their part] that this very creation [i. e. these his creatures] will be delivered from the bondage of corruption, and admitted to the glorious liberty which pertains to the children of God."

Putting these two passages together, what this annotator calls "their own fault," is a consequence of what he considers to be *not their own* fault; and therefore accompanied with *hope*, as an earnest of ultimate deliverance.

"We do not say the Lord Jesus is a *great* Saviour, and then *weaken*

his salvation by confining it to a *fraction* of the human family however large. But we do say, and prove too from Scripture, in beautiful harmony one part with another, that the Saviour is *equal* to the salvation, and the salvation *worthy* of the Saviour. The Saviour *able* to save all —the salvation *for* all; so that *immensely* beyond all sin by the first Adam creature, *extends* the salvation by the second Adam Redeemer. We do not affirm the Saviour is *infinite*, and his atonement *universal*, with one breath, and then affirm the salvation is *partial*, and the atonement *limited*, with another breath; for we boldly renounce all such inconsistent trifling." *A Few Brief Comments on a Tract by J. N. D. By Philomath*, p. 10.

R. R.

EXTRACT FROM THE LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE OF JOHN FOSTER, EDITED BY J. E. RYLAND. IN TWO VOLUMES. *London; Jackson and Walford.* 1846.

To the able and impressive extract given in our last number, (p. 9, 10,) from Sir James Stephen's Essays, we now add another of a similar description, and for the same purpose. We cannot always, however, unreservedly assent to Mr. Foster's admissions; and particularly object to that in which, speaking of certain Scripture expressions, he says, "On *no* allowable interpretation do they signify less than a very protracted and formidable severity"—an admission, founded, wholly and solely, on their mistaken application to a future state of existence.

"Letter to a young Minister, in answer to one in which he stated his inquiries and difficulties on the subject of the eternity of future punishments."

"DEAR SIR,—If you could have been apprised how much less research I have made into what has been written on the subject of your letter than you appear to have done, you would have had little expectation of assistance in deciding your judgment. I have perhaps been too content to let an opinion (or impression) admitted in early life dispense with protracted inquiry and various reading, The general, not very far short of universal, judgment of divines in affirmation of the doctrine of eternal punishment must be acknowledged a weighty consideration. It is a very fair question, is it likely that so many thousands of able, learned, benevolent, and pious men should all have been in error? And the language of Scripture is formidably strong; so strong that it must be an argument of extreme cogency that would authorize a limited interpretation.

"Nevertheless, I acknowledge myself *not* convinced of the orthodox doctrine. If asked, *why* not?—I should have little to say in the way of criticism, of implications found or sought in what may be called incidental expressions of Scripture, or of the passages dubiously cited in favour of final, universal restitution. It is the moral argument, as it may be named, that presses irresistibly on my mind—that which comes in the stupendous idea of eternity.

"It appears to me that the teachers and believers of the orthodox doctrine hardly ever make an earnest, strenuous effort to form a conception of eternity; or rather a conception somewhat of the nature of a faint, incipient approximation. Because it is confessedly beyond the compass of thought, it is suffered to go without an attempt at thinking of it. They utter the term in the easy currency of language; have a vague and transitory idea of something obscures vast, and do not labour to place and detain the mind in intense protracted coetemplation, seeking all expedients for expanding and aggravating the awful import of such a word. Though every mode of illustration is feeble and impotent, one would surely think there would be an insuppressible impulse to send forth the thoughts to the utmost possible reach into the immensity—when it is an immensity into which our own most essential interests are infinitely extended. Truly it *is* very strange that even religious minds can keep so quietly aloof from the amazing, the overwhelming contemplation of what they have the destiny and the near prospect of entering upon.

"Expedients of illustration of what eternity is *not*, supply the best attainable means of assisting remotely toward a glimmering apprehension of what it *is*. All that is within human capacity is to imagine the vastest measures of *time*, and to look to the termination of these as only touching the mere commencement of eternity.

"For example: it has been suggested* to imagine the number of particles, or atoms, contained in this globe, and suppose them one by one annihilated, each in a thousand years, till all were gone; but just as well say, a million, or a million of millions of years or ages, it is all the same, as against infinite duration.

"Extend the thought of such a process to our whole mundane system, and finally to the whole material universe: it is still the same. Or imagine a series of numerical figures, in close order, extended to a line of such a length that it would encircle the globe, like the equator—or that would run along, with the earth's orbit round the sun—or with the outermost planet, Uranus—or that would draw a circle of which the radius should be from the earth or sun to Sirius—or that should encompass the entire material universe, which as being material cannot be infinite. The most stupendous of these measures of *time* would have an end; and would when completed, be still *nothing to eternity*.

"Now think of an infliction of misery protracted through such a period, and at the end of it being only *commencing*,—not one smallest step nearer a conclusion:—the case just the same if that sum of figures were multiplied by itself. And then think of *man*—his nature, his situation, the circumstances of his brief sojourn and trial on earth. Far be it from us to make light of the demerit of sin, and to remonstrate with the supreme Judge against a severe chastisement, of whatever moral nature we may regard the infliction to be. But still, what is man? —He comes into the world with a nature fatally corrupt, and powerfully tending to actual evil. He comes among a crowd of temptations adapted to his innate evil propensities. He grows up (incomparably the greater proportion of the race) in great ignorance; his judgment weak, and under number-

* "In the Spectator I think. (No. 575, Monday, Aug. 2, 1714.—Ed.)"

less beguilements into error; while his passions and appetites are strong; his conscience unequally matched against their power; —in the majority of men, but feebly and rudely constituted. The influence of whatever good instructions he may receive is counteracted by a combination of opposite influences almost constantly acting on him. He is essentially and inevitably unapt to be powerfully acted on by what is invisible and future.". . . . "In short, his condition is such that there is no hope of him, but from a direct, special operation on him of what we denominate divine grace.—*Is* it not so? *are* we not convinced—*is* it not the plain doctrine of Scripture—*is* there not irresistible evidence from a view of the actual condition of the human world,—that no man can become good, in the Christian sense, can become fit for a holy and happy place hereafter, but by this operation *ab extra*? But this is arbitrary and discriminative on the part of the sovereign Agent, and independent of the will of man. And how awfully evident is it, that this indispensable operation takes place only on a comparatively small proportion of the collective race!

"Now this creature, thus constituted and circumstanced, passes a few fleeting years on earth, a short sinful course; in which he does often what, notwithstanding his ignorance and ill-disciplined judgment and conscience, he knows to be wrong, and neglects what he knows to be his duty; and consequently, for a greater or less measure of guilt, widely different in different offenders, deserves punishment. But endless punishment! hopeless misery, through a duration to which the enormous terms above imagined will be absolutely nothing! I acknowledge my inability (I would say it reverently) to admit this belief, together with a belief in the divine goodness—the belief that "God is love," that "his tender mercies are over all his works." Goodness, benevolence, charity as ascribed in supreme perfection to him, cannot mean a quality foreign to all human conceptions of goodness; it must be something analogous in principle to what himself has defined and required as goodness in his moral creatures, that in adoring the divine goodness, we may not be worshipping an "unknown God." But if so, how would all our ideas be confounded, while contemplating him bringing, of his own sovereign will, a race of creatures into existence, in such a condition that they certainly will and must,—*must*, by their nature and circumstances, go wrong, and be miserable unless prevented by especial grace,—which is the privilege of only a small proportion of them, and at the same time affixing on their delinquency a doom of which it is infinitely beyond the highest archangel's faculty to apprehend a thousandth part of the horror.

"It must be in deep humility that we venture to apply to the measures of the divine government, the rules indispensable to the equity of human administration. Yet we may advert to the principle in human legislation that the man tempted to crime should, as far as possible without actual experience, be apprized of the nature and measure of the penal consequence. It should be something the main force of which can be placed in intelligible *opposition*, so to speak, to the temptation. If it be something totally out of the scope of his faculties to apprehend, to realize to his mind, that *threatened something is unknown*, has not its appropriate fitness to deter him. There is, or may be, in it what would be of mighty force to deter him if *he could have a competent*

notion of it; but his necessary ignorance precludes from him that salutary force. Is he not thus taken at a fearful disadvantage? As a motive to deter him, the threatened penalty can only be in the proportion to his (in the present case) narrow faculty of apprehending it; but as an evil to be suffered it surpasses in magnitude every intellect but the Omniscient. Might we not imagine the reflection of one of the condemned delinquents suffering on, and still interminably on, through a thousand or a million of ages, to be expressed in some such manner as this:—Oh! if it had been possible for me to conceive the most diminutive part of the weight and horror of this doom, every temptation to sin would have been enough to strike me dead with terror; I should have shrunk from it with the most violent recoil.

"A common argument has been that sin is an *infinite evil*, that is, of infinite demerit, as an offence against an infinite Being; and that since a finite creature cannot suffer infinitely *in measure*, he must *in duration*. But surely, in all reason, the limited and in the present instance *diminutive nature of the criminal* must be an essential part of the case for judgment. Every act must for one of its proportions, be measured by the nature and condition of the agent. And it would seem that one principle in that rule of proportion should be, that the offending agent should be capable of being aware of the magnitude (the *amount*, if we might use such a word) of the offence he commits, by being capable of something like an adequate conception of the being against whom it is committed. A perverse child committing an offence against a great monarch, of whose dignity it *had some*, but a vastly inadequate, apprehension, would not be punished in the same manner as an offender of high endowments and responsibility, and fully aware of the dignity of the personage offended. The one would justly be sharply chastised; the other might as justly be condemned to death. In the present case, the offender does or may know that the Being offended against is of awful majesty; and therefore the offence is one of great aggravation, and he will justly be punished with great severity; but, by his extremely contracted and feeble faculties, as the lowest in the scale of strictly rational and accountable creatures in the whole creation, he is infinitely incapable of any adequate conception of the greatness of the Being offended against. He is, then, according to the argument, obnoxious to a punishment not in any proportion to his own nature, but alone to that infinity of the supreme nature, which is to him infinitely inconceivable and unknown.

"If an evil act of a human being may be of infinite demerit, why may not a good one be of infinite excellence or merit as having also a reference to the infinite Being? Is it not plain that every act of a finite nature must have in all senses the finite quality of that nature?—cannot therefore be of infinite demerit.

"Can we—I would say with reverence—can we realize it as possible that a lost soul, after countless millions of ages, and in prospect of an interminable succession of such enormous periods, can be made to have the conviction, absolute and perfect, that all this is a just, an equitable infliction, and from a Power as *good* as he is just, for a few short sinful years on earth—years and sins presumed to be retained most vividly in memory, and everlastingly growing clearer, vaster, and more terrible to retrospective view in their magnitude of infinite evil—

every stupendous period of duration, by which they have actually been left at a distance, seeming to bring them, in contrariety to all laws of memory, nearer and ever nearer to view, by the continually aggravated experience of their consequences?

"Yes, those twenty, forty, seventy years, growing up to infinity of horror in the review, in proportion to the distance which the condemned spirit recedes from them;—all eternity not sufficing to reveal fully what those years contained! —millions of ages for each single evil thought or word!

"But it is usually alleged that there will be an endless *continuance* of sinning with probably an endless aggravation, and *therefore* the punishment must be endless. Is not this like an admission of disproportion between the punishment and the *original cause* of its infliction?—But suppose the case to be so—that is to say, that the punishment is not a retribution *simply* for the guilt of the momentary existence on earth, but a continued punishment of the continued, ever-aggravated guilt in the eternal state; the allegation is of no avail in vindication of the doctrine; because the first consignment to the dreadful state *necessitates a continuance of the criminality;* the doctrine teaching that it is of the essence, and is an awful aggravation, of the original consignment, that it dooms the condemned to maintain the criminal spirit unchanged for ever. The doom to *sin* as well as suffer, and according to the argument, to sin in *order* to suffer, is inflicted as the punishment of the sin committed in the mortal state. Virtually, therefore, the eternal punishment is the punishment of the sins of time.

"Under the light (or the darkness) of this doctrine, how inconceivably mysterious and awful is the aspect of the whole economy of this human world! The immensely greater number of the race hitherto, through all ages and regions, passing a short life under no illuminating, transforming influence of their Creator; ninety-nine in a hundred of them perhaps having never even received any authenticated message from heaven, passing off the world in a state unfit for a spiritual, heavenly, and happy kingdom elsewhere; and all destined to everlasting misery. The thoughtful spirit has a question silently suggested to it of far more emphatic import than that of him, who exclaimed, 'Hast thou made all men *in vain?*'

"Even the dispensation of redemption by the Mediator, the only light that shines through this dark economy,—how profoundly mysterious in its slow progress, as yet, in its uncorrupted purity and saving efficacy. What proportion of the earth's inhabitants are, at this hour, the subjects of its vital agency? It was not the divine volition that the success should be greater,—that a greater number should be saved by it,—or most certainly, most necessarily, its efficacy *would* have been greater. But in thus withholding from so large a proportion of mankind even the knowledge, and from so vast a majority in the nominally Christian nations the divine application, indispensable to the efficacy of the Christian dispensation, could it be that the divine purpose was to consign so many of his creatures, existing under such fearful circumstances, to the doom of eternal misery? Does the belief consist with any conception we can form of infinite goodness combined with infinite power?

"But, after all this, we have to meet the grave question, *What say the Scrip-*

tures? There is a force in their expressions at which we well may tremble. On *no* allowable interpretation do they signify less than a very protracted duration and formidable severity. But I hope it is not presumptuous to take advantage of the fact, that the terms everlasting, eternal, forever, original or translated, are often employed in the Bible, as well as other writings, under great and various limitations of import; and are thus withdrawn from the predicament of *necessarily and absolutely* meaning a strictly endless duration. The limitation is often, indeed, plainly marked by the nature of the subject. In other instances the words are used with a figurative indefiniteness which leaves the limitation to be made by some general rule of reason and proportion. They are designed to magnify, to aggravate, rather than to define. My resource in the present case, then, is simple this—that since the terms do not necessarily and absolutely signify an interminable duration,—and since there is in the present instance to be pleaded, for admitting a limited interpretation, a reason in the moral estimate of things, of stupendous, of infinite urgency, involving our conceptions of the divine goodness and equity, and leaving those conceptions overwhelmed in darkness and horror if it be rejected, I therefore conclude that a limited intrepretation is authorized. Perhaps there is some pertinence in a suggestion which I recollect to have seen in some old and nearly unknown book in favour of universal restitution;—that the great difference of *degrees* of future punishment, so plainly stated in Scripture, affords an argument against its perpetuity; since, if the demerit be infinite, there can be no place for a scale of degrees, apportioning a minor infliction to some offenders;—every one should be punished up to the utmost that his nature can sustain; and the same reason of equity there may be for a limited measure, there may consistently be for a limited duration. The assignment of an unlimited duration would seem an abandonment of the *principle* of the discriminating rule observed in the adjustment of degrees."

"It often surprises me that the fearful doctrine sits, if I may so express it, so easy on the minds of the religious and benevolent believers of it. Surrounded immediately by the multitudes of fellow-mortals, and looking abroad on the present, and back on the past state of the race, and regarding them, as to the immense majority, as subjects of so direful destination, how *can* they have any calm enjoyment of life, how can they be cordially cheerful, how can they escape the incessant haunting of dismal ideas, darkening the economy in which their lot is cast? I remember suggesting to one of them such an image as this:—suppose the case that so many of the great surrounding population as he could not, even in a judgment of charity, believe to be Christians, that is, to be in a safe state for hereafter,—suppose the case to be that he knew so many were all doomed to suffer, by penal infliction, a death by torture, in the most protracted agony, with what feelings would he look on the populous city, the swarming country, or even a crowded mixed congregation? But what an infinitesimal trifle that would be in comparison with what he does believe in looking on these multitudes! How, then, can they bear the sight of the living world around around them?

"As to religious teachers; if the tremendous doctrine be true, surely it ought almost continually to be proclaimed as with the blast of a trumpet, inculcated

and reiterated, with ardent passion, in every possible form of terrible illustration; no remission of the alarm to thoughtless spirits. What! believe them in such inconceivably dreadful peril, and not multiply and aggravate the terrors to frighten them out of their stupor; deploring still, that all the horrifying representations in the power of thought and language to make, are immeasurably below the real urgency of the subject; and almost wishing that some appalling phenomenon of sight or sound might break in to make the impression that no words can make. If we saw a fellow-mortal stepping heedlessly or daringly on the utmost verge of some dreadful precipice or gulf, a humane spectator would raise and *continue* a shout, a scream, to prevent him. How then can it comport with the duty of preachers to satisfy themselves with brief, occasional references to this awful topic, when the most prolonged thundering alarm is but as the note of an infant, a bird, or an insect, in proportion to the horrible urgency of the case?

"A number (not large, but of great piety and intelligence) of ministers within my acquaintance, several now dead, have been disbelievers of the doctrine in question; at the same time not feeling themselves imperatively called upon to make a public disavowal; content with employing in their ministrations strong general terms in denouncing the doom of impenitent sinners. For one thing, a consideration of the unreasonable imputations and unmeasured suspicions apt to be cast on any publicly declared partial defection from rigid orthodoxy, has made them think they should better consult their usefulness by not giving a prominence to this dissentient point; while yet they make no concealment of it in private communications, and in answer to serious inquiries. When, besides, they have considered how strangely defective and feeble is the efficacy to alarm and deter careless, irreligious minds, of the terrible doctrine itself notionally admitted by them, they have thought themselves the less required to propound one that so greatly qualifies the blackness of the prospect. They could not be unaware of the grievous truth of what is so strongly insisted on as an argument by the defenders of the tenet,—that thoughtless and wicked men would be sure to seize on the mitigated doctrine to encourage themselves in their impenitence. But this is only the same perverse and fatal use that they make of the doctrine of grace and mercy through Jesus Christ. If they *will* so abuse the truth we cannot help it.—But methinks even this fact tells against the doctrine in question. If the very nature of man as created, every individual, by the sovereign Power, be in such desperate disorder that there is no possibility of conversion and salvation except in the instances where that Power interposes with a special and redeeming efficacy, how can we conceive that the main proportion of the race thus morally impotent (that is really and absolutely impotent) will be eternally punished for the inevitable result of this moral impotence? But this I have said before.

"With all good wishes for the success of your studies and ministrations, I am, dear sir, yours truly, J. F."

Summary of "An Inquiry into the Nature, Progress, and End of Prophecy, in Three Books. I. On the Covenants. II. An Exposition of the Visions of the Prophet Daniel. III. An Exposition of the Revelation of St. John. To which is prefixed a Preface and Introduction, in Three Parts. By Samuel Lee, D.D., late Regius Professor of Hebrew, and formerly Sir Thomas Adam's Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge; D.D. of the University of Halle; Canon of Bristol; Rector of Barley, Herts, &c. *London: Seeley, Fleet Street.* 1849."

(*Continued from p.* 23.)

BOOK I.

ON THE COVENANTS.

Chapter I.

Sect. 1.—*General Remarks on the Nature of Revelation.*

It is necessary, in interpreting sacred Scripture, to remember its leading characteristics: that its language has ceased to be vernacular; that its opinions and customs, and its exclusive peculiarities, have become obsolete; and that the book stands before our contemplation as the high record of wonderful proceedings, under a respective and peculiar combination of circumstances. The dispensations unfolded on its pages are, the Patriarchial, the Mosaic, and the Christian. The two first are chiefly distinguished by peculiar rites: the first, applicable universally to mankind at large, the second, limited to the descendants of Abraham and the land of Canaan; the last, the Christian, to which no other shall succeed, is again universal, and its glories are to be proclaimed throughout the world. The divine authority of the record is evidenced by the immediate appearance of Deity, the fulfilment of predictions then made, and the performance of acts to which men are unequal.

The first two dispensations shadowed forth things to come. They were visible and tangible. The deluge, the children of Israel in the wilderness, in Canaan, in Babylon, were all the visible and tangible interposition of God. Their temple, and its services, shadowing forth good things to come, all combine a system of evidence real and substantial; which, in the fulness of time, was established, when the new, the spiritual, and the heavenly covenant was made. We are not to look for the purely spiritual in the first covenants, but in the last. The first have passed away. Canaan is no longer the exclusive country of the descendants of Abraham, who now, in Christ, have become the spiritual seed; and, in this sense, they succeed to the heritage of the Gentiles. The only Zion now known is the heavenly Jerusalem, the city of the living God. There can be no captivity now, but in a spiritual sense; nor any earthly Babylon. The whole world is the new inheritance, to which the spiritual seed of Abraham is heir. (Comp. Isaiah v. 1—7 with Matt. xxi. 33—46, and John iv. 10—24.) The Jews could see nothing beyond the tangible and visible, but Jesus had to teach them the spiritual and invisible.

We learn then, on this subject, that as none but God could have been the founder and king of the Zion of old; so the glories and consummate grace of the spiritual, universal, and never-ending empire of the New Jerusalem and Zion, under the Son of Man, were intended to be the great object set forth: the unspeakably glorious consummation, under which Jew and Gentile, Barbarian, Scythian, bond and free, should be made the sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty, none but God could promise and consecrate for ever.

Sect. II.—*On the purely religious nature of Revelation, &c.*

Prophecy coming from God must be holy and true, and it must also command the confidence of the faithful. To this end it must be precise: it must mean some one event, some one thing, on which the believer can seize and feel

assured, that he is not mistaken. For instance—the fall of Babylon, of Egypt, Assyria, and Idumea, are all well known, undisputed fulfilments of God's predictions. Again, the birth of Christ, that He should "be cut off;" that the people of the Prince who should come, should destroy Jerusalem; and that the Desolator should also fall. Dan. ix. 27. These are also well known and undisputed fulfilments, which never will and never can be fulfilled again. But if the system, under which these predictions were made, was itself *typical* and *shadowy*, and had the property of pointing to another which should be considered as its antitype, or fulfilment in a *mystical* sense, then the fall of a mystical Babylon would be no second fulfilment of the predictions made, as to the first and literal sense; and no more constituting the *same thing* than the sacrifice of Christ did the sacrifices which typified it. We have only that which is necessary in such a case, viz. the *type* looking onward to its *antitype*.

Sect. III.—*On the means provided under the first Covenant for the establishment of the last.*

Let us search sacred Scripture as to the means by which Judaism was merged into Christianity. The first members gathered to the apostolic Church were those Jews who constituted the true and holy family under the first covenant, who thus primarily became partakers of the second. The apostle, addressing the Hebrews, shows how he regarded the converted Jew in his day—"But *ye* are come unto Mount Sion, unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem," &c.; and so again in the allegory, Gal. iv. 25, seq. we are told, that the earthly Jerusalem is in bondage; while, in the next verse, the heavenly is declared to be the mother of us all. And so Isaiah predicted that, in the last days (of the Jewish dispensation), the mountain of the Lord's house (i. e. the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem) should be established on the top of the mountains, and be exalted above the hills, and that all nations should flow into it. Is. ii. 2, seq. Surely this must be the spiritual Canaan promised to Abraham, the heir of the whole earth. "For the promise to Abraham, that he should be heir of the world, was not to Abraham or *his seed*, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith."—Rom. iv. 13, *seq.*

Now let us turn our attention to the manner in which the holy Remnant, who should first believe the gospel, are spoken of in Scripture. In Isaiah x. 20, it is written—"The remnant" (not the whole nation of the Jews, who cried *Crucify him*) "shall return, even the remnant of Jacob, unto the mighty God." What can this mean, but the apostolic church coming to the living God in the heavenly Jerusalem. In Isaiah ix. 6, and Luke i. 32, we have both the prophet and the Angel speaking of the same child, that to Him should the remnant and the escaped of Jacob in that day return. So the apostle, Rom. ix. 27, xi. 1, Moses, Elijah, Isaiah, and Paul, speak of one remnant, constituting God's holy family.

True, says the objector; but blindness, in part, is happened unto Israel *until* the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. What then are we to infer from this particle '*until?*' If its import is still future, what are we to make of such passages as Gen. xxviii and Isaiah xxii. 14? Surely this vocable cannot deduce an event of prophecy contrary to its whole tenor. The simple truth appears to be contained in the fact, that the Gentile, or Christ's kingdom, is to have no end; that the Jew is rejected until this kingdom is come in; and then he has to repent and believe in the glad tidings of the kingdom. The period marked by Daniel for that consummation is his seventieth week; and beyond this period, prophecy is silent. "Turn ye, turn ye, O house of Israel, why will ye die," admits neither of a prophetic nor a Calvinistic interpretation. "If they abide not in unbelief, they may be grafted in:" i. e. be again inserted in the true *stock* of Israel.

Sect. IV.—*On the question, whether any return of the Jews to Canaan is to be expected.*

The prevailing opinion is, that no other interpretation can be justified from

the law and the prophets, than that they contain predictions of their return, and consequent conversion, after their last and general dispersion. The law and the prophets are full of promises to them that *appear* to sanction this interpretation. Lev. xxvi. 42, seq., Deut. xxx. 5, Is. xi. 10, seq. But its advocates forget or overlook the fact, that it was only "*a remnant*" that was recovered from Babylon. How then can these predictions be applied universally to Israel's restoration? Besides, there are passages that plainly declare, that, after the last dispersion, there shall be no return. Ezek. vii.; Deut. xxii. 15, seq.; Dan. xii. 1—4; Deut. xxviii.; Matt. xxiv. 17—28; Luke xxi. 21, seq. It is here said, in verse 13 of Ezek. vii, "The multitude shall not return;" and this in opposition to the very small remnant called the escaped in ver. 16. The dispersion here spoken of is that which took place under the conquest of heathen Rome, and remains to this day; and, according to Ezekiel, they shall never return. Scripture never promises a return to the multitude; the promise is always to '*the remnant;*' and their return is always spiritual, "to the majesty of God," and "the heavenly Jerusalem."—Ezek. xi. 13—21; Is. lxvi; Acts xiii. 26—41; Micah ii. 12, and iii.; and Isaiah xlix. In this last chapter, Dr. Lee instructs us, that the Israel of the 3rd and 6th verse is not the Israel of the 5th verse, nor the Jacob of the 6th. The one is to bring to God, and to raise up, as from the dead, his tribes; the other is in a situation to be so brought and to be so raised. The context determines the true and entire Israel. So again, in the Psalms, we constantly have the same distinction. In Ps. lxxxvii. 8, seq., Zion, as in Ezek. is oppposed to the dwellings of Jacob. "His foundation is in the holy mountains,"—taking us to the heavenly city, that hath foundations, &c. Is. xlviii, lxxix, and lxxx. Ps. xiv. 7, and liii. 6, bring back the captivity of his people, i. e. by giving them salvation, not in a return from some foreign land, but from strange servitude. "Jacob shall rejoice, and Israel shall *be glad.*"

Sect. V.—*On some particular places in Jeremiah and Ezekiel which have been supposed to foretel a return of the Jews to Canaan.*

Let us consider Jer. xxx.—At the 7th verse we are told of "the time of Jacob's trouble," with the promise that "he should be saved out of it." (See also Ezek. vii. 7, seq.) Dan. xii. 1, and Matt xxiv. 21, 22, sufficiently determine the time of this great trouble. But at ver. 9 we are told that David their king shall be raised up unto them, unto God's people both of Israel and Judah. None but Jesus can possibly answer to the prediction. His return from captivity must therefore be after his appearing in the flesh.—Gal. iv. 4, Eph. i. 10. It must follow accordingly that the terms "my people" here (Jer. xxx. 3) must apply to those only who are made partakers in the new covenant, and become the subjects of the spiritual David; in other words the remnant, or the election. These are times when the shadows of the law come to an end, and the spiritual Abraham succeeds, according to the everlasting covenant, to the spiritual Zion. Heb. xii. 18. So the 10th verse can only be applicable to believers, not to those Jews who were not a people.—Is. xlix. Read in the same light Jer. xxx. 16, 17, &c. So again in verses 23, 24, the vengeance is upon the head of the wicked. The land therefore of the 3rd verse cannot be Canaan, which was held in temporary tenure, but the whole earth, given to Abraham under the first, the everlasting covenant; and to this inheritance, as from captivity, should her spiritual seed return under David, their spiritual king, in perfect freedom.

Now look back to v. 11, which refers to the mystical destruction of the then moral state of things. The scattered are styled outcasts, dispersed, διασπορα, the elect of Peter, whose restoration actually took place in the latter days.—James i. 1. These scattered ones returned to the true Mount Zion. Some of them sold their possessions in the earthly Canaan, and declared plainly, with Abraham, that they sought a heavenly city; while the unbelieving Jews looked for the restoration of that which was only temporary, and has long ago

passed away. Verses 12—17, taken spiritually, are not applicable to the reprobate party, but to the true Zion of God: the incurable bruise indicating the old nature warring against the new. Verse 15 shows them a praying people, the character of the redeemed, Is. xix. 20. Jer. xxx. 18—The "heap" (hill) in this verse has no relation to the literal Jerusalem, which was not built upon a hill: the hills were round about the literal, while the true Zion hath her foundation on the mountains of holiness. The heavenly Jerusalem is alone the object of desire to the regenerated convert. Her foundation is on the rock of ages, apostles are her pillars and ground of truth.—1 Tim. iii. 15, Rev. xxi. 14. The nominal Zion were the bitterest enemies of the true, and are represented in verses 23, 24, which actually came to pass in the latter days.

Jer. xxxi.—Dr. Lee places the period of this chapter as commencing with the resurrection of Christ, and ending in the universal establishment of his church. He contends, that "all the families" of Jeremiah are identical with the remnant of Isaiah xi. 10, which shows that it was only a remnant that was recovered from Babylon.—See Ezek. xi. 13, 21. Also vii. 13, 14, 16, which latter quotation shows a clear distinction "touching the whole multitude which shall not return," and "the escaped that shall be on the mountain like doves," &c.

Compare v. 7 of this chapter, Jer. xxxi. with Is. x. 21, and Rom. ix. 6. Jer. xxxi. 11, compared with Is. xlix. 24, predicts all that literally took place in the latter days of the Jewish dispensation; when the true Jacob was ransomed from the hand of the strong man, and the lawful captive delivered.

Verses 12—14 are applicable to the true Israel, who became the apostolic church.

Jer. xxxi. 15, and Matt. ii. 17, 18, fix the times to which these prophecies relate.

Verses 16—21—Gospel times, "thine end," referring to the end of Judaism —"thy border" must signify, not the Jerusalem in bondage with her children which was to be destroyed, but the heavenly.—Heb. xii. 22.

Verse 22.—The miraculous birth of Christ.—See Prov. xxx. 10. Our translation is sadly defective—more literally, surround, comprehend, inclose, i. e. within her, a great or eminent man.

Verse 31.—Compare Ezek. xi. 19, Heb. viii. 13, and x. 16.

Verse 36.—This verse is repeated frequently, as strongly supporting the popular opinion of the restoration of carnal Israel; but the promise is to her *seed*, who are the true, (1 Pet. xi. 9) while carnal Jews are *now* no nation and no people.

Verse 38.—For the city of this verse, see Ezek. xlviii. and Rev. xxi. 10, seq.

This chapter, so explained, shows that it does not contain a syllable of a general return of the Jews to Palestine, on the contrary, all is strictly consonant with the church, or Christ's kingdom, as established by his apostles; and in harmony with the declarations of the prophets and the covenants.

Dr. Lee, on similar principles, very ably interprets Ezekiel xxxvi. and xxxvii. but our limits forbid our following the learned Doctor further on this subject; and we must refer the reader to the work itself, or to his own intelligence from the principles of interpretation now unfolded.

SECT. VI.—*On the Causes of the Dispersion of the Remnant, or holy party among the Jews, and of its return from this.*

Jer. xxiii. 3, declares the remnant shall be gathered out of all countries, brought back to their folds, made fruitful, and increased; which was fulfilled during apostolic times. (Compare Ezek. xxxiv. 13—31, Isaiah xxx. 25, and xli. 8, 9.) This remnant are to be driven out, preyed upon, thrust, their oppressors being carnal temporizing Jews.—Jer. xxxiii. 9, Zeph. iii. 19. The prophet Amos, ii. 6, and viii. 5, 6, and 14, charges them directly with this oppression.—Joel iii. 2, seq. Obad. 2.

The shadows of the law are past and gone; and can no longer direct us, who

have the bright beams of God's love shining in the face of his beloved Son, the true David, on his glorious throne in the heavenly Jerusalem, according to the everlasting covenant made with Abraham; and this cannot be confined to or interpreted of any thing earthly, but comprehends, as its citizens, all in every place and name, who are blessed with Abraham's faith. To this Jerusalem, we must all return from the captivity of sin, and turn from the power of Satan to the mighty God.—See Is. vi. 13, Rom. xi. 17, seq.; x. 6, seq.; 2 Cor. iii. 6—18.

Chapter II.

Sect. I.—*On the Duration of the Theocracy and the Times of its close.*

Dr. Lee brings before our consideration the covenants God made with Abraham, which he shows were two. The first was purely religious and of a universal and permanent character.—Gen. xii. 2, 3. This was made in Ur of the Chaldees. The second covenant was made on Abraham's arrival in the land of Canaan.—See verses 6, 7. In chap. xiii. 14—18, it is limited as to time ands pace. The word translated "for ever" in the Scripture signifies any continuous indefinite period. This second covenant, the apostle tells us, had become old, and had passed away. In Gen. xv, after the promise of a son, the Lord makes a particular and formal covenant with Abraham, purely and entirely with regard to this grant of the land of Canaan.—Ps. cv. In Gen. xvii, both covenants are ratified; the first in verses 2—7 (compare Rom. iv. 17—25); and, from verses 7—15, we have the second covenant ratified with the rite of circumcision. Under the first, Abram's name is changed (Rom. iv. 13); and its consummation is in the resurrection state, in the city for which the patriarch looked. This covenant is also referred to in Gen. xvii. 15, 16; xviii. 10—18; and xxii. 17—19. This is the everlasting covenant. The other was temporary: Canaan and circumcision are now no longer acknowledged by God. The Jews are no longer a people, no more beloved as such. God's people are called by a new name, Christian, the holy people.—Rom. ix. 25, seq. As a peculiar people, God will have no mercy on them.—Hosea i. 6, 9.

Sect. II.—*On such places of the Old Testament as speak of the close of the Theocracy, and for the establishment of a New Covenant, under the terms,* the latter day or days, the last days, end or ends of the world, the day or the great day of the Lord, *and the like.*

The first time the words "last days" occur is in Gen. xlix. 1. Verse 10, compared with Ezek. xxi. 27, can leave no other conviction on the mind than that these last days are Christ's days.

The expression does not occur again till we come to Num. xxiv. 14—17, which is exactly parallel to Genesis. In connection with this prophecy, consult Is. xi. 14, xv. xvi. 13, 14, and Jer. xlviii. If taken, as Dr. Lee proposes, in a spiritual sense, then it is applicable to the ships of this period spoken of in Daniel xi. 30.

The next time the words occur, is in Deut. iv. 30, which contains no promise of return to Canaan; but blessing, if they return to their merciful God—"the mighty God"—while verse 26 contains a prophecy, of which we witness the fulfilment at this day.

Again, Deut. xxxi. 29, distinctly marks the end *de facto* of the Jewish polity. The context of xxxii. 29 refers strictly to the Jewish polity. So in ver. 20—22, we have the destruction of the earth, i. e. of the land, by fire—in ver. 26, their scattering—and in ver. 43, the calling of the Gentiles, and Christ reigning with his people, viz. his holy remnant. See xxxiii. 19, 26—29.

Job xix. 25 marks the same period.

Isaiah ii. 2, refers to the time in which the nations should receive the Gospel; termed in ver. 12 the day of the Lord. Let this be borne in mind.

Jer. xxiii, xxx. 7, seq. carries on the events to the times of Christ. See xxxi. 31, seq.

Read Ezek. vi. 8, where, after the desolating judgments, we again find the holy remnant, who shall declare the glory of God to the Gentiles. Isaiah lxvi. 19.

Again, Ezek. vii. 2, seq. and Micah iv. v.

Sect. III.—*On Places in the New Testament* referring *to the* last days, the end, *or* ends of the world, *and the like.*

Now let us turn to the New Testament. Luke xxii. 37. The things concerning Christ have an end, or complete fulfilment. xxi. 22, Dan. ix. 26. 27, Matt. xvi. 28, Dan. vii. 13, seq., Matt. xxiv. 31. "His angels," viz. messengers, apostles to gather his elect, viz. remnant. The appearance of Christ cannot be personal or visible, for He testifies, "The world seeth me no more," John xiv. 19; but he shall come as in the clouds.—Zech. ix. 14, seq.

1 Peter i. 5, speaks of a salvation ready to be revealed; and what could this be, but the complete revelation and recognition of Christ throughout the world? See ver. 10. But that there might be no manner of doubt on the subject, we have an inspired commentary by Peter, in Acts ii. 14, seq.

The end of all things must not be mistaken for the physical dissolution of the world, but to what sacred Scripture so plainly applies it—the passing away of the temporary covenant, that the everlasting one might remain: i. e. the universal kingdom of the Son of man, in which all things shall be made new—a new creation spiritually considered. So read 1 Peter iv. 7, Matt. xxiv. 42, and Luke xxi. 36. In 1 Cor. x. 11, εἰσ οὑσ τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων, literally "to whom have arrived the ends of the ages or dispensations."

To conclude. Christ coming in power is the establishment of his kingdom *de facto*: consequently the temporary one has passed away. Then, under this state of things, no Jewish, no Gentile millenium, is wanted, nor any predicted. The things prefigured by the temporary, are fulfilled in the everlasting covenant, and shall continue as the days of heaven before him.

Appendix.

On the Scriptural usage of the terms αιων, αιωνες, αιωνες των αιώνων, *in the sense of Age, Dispensation,* &c.

Dr. Lee says they signify indefinite portions of future time; and thence, by a metonymy, either persons or things connected with them. Αιων, compounded of αεὶ and ων, i. e. αιων, has two applications: 1. Some indefinite period, as to the present state of things. 2. Eternity. But, in no case in Scripture is the physical world meant by the word. We must, therefore, in interpreting these terms, be careful to note the circumstances of the context, otherwise confusion and error must be the result.

PAROIKOS.

(*To be continued.*)

REVIEWS.

The Soul; her Sorrows and her Aspirations. By Francis William Newman, formerly fellow of Baliol College, Oxford. Second Edition. *London: John Chapman, Strand.* 1849.

England has but seldom of late years produced works of a theological nature more deserving of notice than that which now lies before us.

Not that Mr. Newman's volume abounds in much that is positively novel. Any person competently acquainted with the modern German divinity, with the leading modifications which it has undergone in this country, and with Guyon, Fenelon, Law, and others of those commonly designated the mystic writers, (to which, if he shall have added a perusal of Fox and Penn among the Quakers, and Fletcher among the Methodists, so much the better,) will experience no great difficulty in tracing the major part of the sentiments embodied in the work, to their original and appropriate sources. This, however, be it observed, in no respect detracts from the merit of the author, or the claims which he has on our attention. He has made his appearance at the very moment when such a book as his was required, and was likely to tell on the public mind. And well fitted for his self-imposed task has he shown himself to be. Unitarian Theology, viewed as a serious and practical system, is here presented to us in the form of a digest or compendium. He does more than indicate the nature and tendencies of his adopted creed—he gives its very essence and spirit. And this with a freshness, a vigour, a subtlety, and a truthfulness which are peculiarly his own. Mr. Newman is no servile copier of the sentiments of other men. Out of the abundance of his heart his mouth speaks. If we do recollect that we have met with the greater part of his theory in the pages of other writers, this does not interfere with the fact that our author sets nothing down in his own book until he has seen, or fancied that he has seen, it realized in his own experience. Hence his volume is a peculiarly honest one. And this not more in the principles which it lays down, than in the conclusions which it unhesitatingly adopts. The style is pure, classical, and singularly perspicuous. We are reminded at every step that we have to do with a scholar, a man of sense, and a gentleman. Powers of sarcasm, of a high order, our author evidently possesses; and from time to time we observe him repressing with difficulty the sneer, and the swellings of virtuous indignation. But his feelings are constantly under control. Being an amiable man, and having much commiseration for the wretched, the language of kindness and affection, not that of severity, is habitual to him. Truly, a most excellent and effective work, upon his own principles, has he produced. Need we then wonder at the interest which it has excited, or at the influence which it is exercising over the minds of intelligent and thoughtful men?

Mr. Newman's plan is very simple; and, assuming the truth of his theory, could scarcely be improved. Soul, that is according to him, the religious principle in man, is his subject. Setting out with this, he presents to us, first the existence in soul of what he denominates "a sense of the infinite." When he has as he thinks sufficiently established this, and thus pointed out the foundation of all religious phenomena as laid in the soul itself, he proceeds to treat in succession of "the sense of sin," "the sense of personal relation to God," "spiritual progress," "hopes concerning future life," and "the prospects of Christianity." With the discussion of the last of these topics, the volume terminates.

Many things in this work command our unqualified assent and approbation. Accurately, faithfully, and sometimes even profoundly, has the author pourtrayed the workings and outgoings of the religious principle in man.* Its delusive operations have not escaped his notice, and are from time to time probed by him with a master's hand. Concurring, not only with the best theologians of Germany, but with all who in every age have shown themselves qualified to deal with the subject, he traces the origin of religious feeling to a region superior to that of the mere intellect. The corrupt state of the Establishment, as well as of dissenting churches, he has ably and fearlessly exposed. Such are a very few of the numerous and important respects in which we conceive Mr. Newman to have done good service to the cause of truth, and to have entitled himself to the best thanks of all who desire to promote the interests of their fellow men.

* The *fleshly* religious principle: of the *spiritual* he knows nothing.

Eulogy, however, is not our present aim in writing; a sterner resolve, contrary although it may be to our feelings, actuated us when we undertook to review the work now lying on our table.

Acute, learned, perspicuous, truthful in its details of his own experience, and wondrously adapted to the spirit and requirements of the age, unquestionably Mr. Newman's book is; but its great object is to propound and recommend to public notice, as pure, heavenly, and according to the mind of God, a system of religion which is essentially anti-Scriptural and anti-Christian. So much so, that if our author's theory be correct, Scripture is one grand lie from beginning to end. And, on the contrary, if the Scriptures be true, upon the system advocated in this work are stamped the broad characters of falsehood and delusion. That any Christian, acquainted with the meaning of language, and possessed of the slenderest *modicum* of experience, should identify Mr. Newman's religion with that produced by the understanding and love of New Testament doctrines, is a sheer impossibility. Truly, our author may well seek to render suspicious, and pour contempt on, the phraseology and reasonings of Scripture; for if the verbal message of God therein presented be worthy of our reverential attachment, the Dagon, which in the work now under review is set up, must fall before it, and be broken in pieces.

Absolutely irreconcilable, indeed necessarily destructive the one of the other, must ever be two systems,—one which represents all religion, whether in "*the once born*" of conscience, or "*the twice born*" of soul, as originating, and being carried on to perfection, in the human mind itself alone—and the other which, while it admits the existence of some such religion as our author describes and contends for, issuing uniformly in condemnation and death, draws our attention to, and bestows its commendation on, a religion exactly opposite to it, originating with and carried on to perfection by God himself, and communicating to those who are made its recipients, as one with Jesus crucified and glorified, the divine privileges of justification and life everlasting.

What we are now stating may become more apparent, if we prosecute our examination of the work before us a little more in detail.

Every one of its fundamental assumptions is erroneous. For brevity's sake, we confine ourselves to the consideration of a few.

Man, according to our author, possesses, or at all events is capable of having developed in himself, "a sense of the infinite." This, we must be permitted, respectfully but at the same time most decidedly, to say, is a mistake. There is not in man naturally any "sense of the infinite," understanding by *infinite*, as the ordinary meaning of language constrains us to do, "that which is really boundless," or "that which spurns at the idea of bounds being prescribed to it by any being, or from any quarter." What man does possess, and what is capable of being gradually developed in him, is "a sense of the indefinite," or of his inability to set bounds to his own thoughts, desires, and attainments, as well as to the thoughts, desires, and attainments of beings like himself: a sense of the existence of something which he himself cannot bound, although to this something it is nevertheless perfectly possible that bounds may be assignable by a higher power. Understanding this distinction, we perceive that *the infinite* is an attribute of the mind of God; while the constitution of the mind of man being *indefinite*, he possesses at the utmost powers and faculties capable of conceiving, and dealing with, the *indefinite* alone. No doubt, indefinite stands to infinite in the relation of shadow to substance. But for shadow by means of its own efforts to become substance, is a plain impossibility. All this Mr. Newman has obviously overlooked. He has forgotten, that it is with human principles, not with an attribute of the divine mind, he has to do. And hence, he has rather unphilosophically, as well as unscripturally, from the admitted fact of man's possessing "a sense of the indefinite," inferred his possessing likewise "a sense of the infinite;" or, at all events, by confounding the indefinite or shadowy, with the infinite or substantial, and ascribing to man naturally a sense of the latter, he has carried

himself out of his own sphere, into one infinitely beyond it. Classical knowledge, of which Mr. Newman possesses no ordinary share, has not, it appears, sufficed to suggest to him the perilousness of such a course of procedure, otherwise the fable of Dædalus and Icarus might have done so. However, in confounding the indefinite or human, with the infinite or divine, and in thus deifying a human principle, our author is merely renewing on a small scale, an attempt which was made unsuccessfully in Paradise about six thousand years ago.

Again: in common with every author of the school to which he belongs, Mr. Newman assumes soul to be identical with spirit. In this, certainly, he and they are not peculiar: the so-called orthodox, with but few exceptions, adopting the same view, and, in conformity to it, employing a similar phraseology. Nevertheless, those Scriptures, the letter of which Mr. Newman so much depreciates and despises, have informed us that soul is not spirit: soul being the living principle of Adam, the creature; and spirit, the life-giving attribute of Jesus, the once crucified but now glorified Creator. *The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit.*—1 Cor. xv. 45. Therefore, not on the ground of mere word-splitting, but on that of soul signifying a human, and spirit a divine principle, to employ the two words soul and Spirit interchangeably, as if they were expressive of one and the same idea, is to confound things which are essentially opposed the one to the other. Besides, in a case like that of Mr. Newman, to acquiesce in his identification of soul and spirit, by not protesting against it, would be actually to surrender the whole subject matter in controversy into his hands. He denominates soul, spirit; and the religious feelings, the sorrows and aspirations which he ascribes to soul, spiritual. We tell him, seriously and advisedly, that he is wrong. Making the assumption which he does, he stumbles at the very threshold of his system. Soulical phenomena, even those of a religious kind, are not, and never can become, spiritual phenomena, being in the very nature of things diametrically opposed to them. To assume the two classes of phenomena to be identical, is merely one proof among the many so conspicuous even on the surface of this very clever book, that the veil of flesh is still interposed between Mr. Newman's mind and the religion of Spirit.

Still farther: one of Mr. Newman's fundamental positions is, the innate and necessary freedom of the human will; its power to throw off and get rid of shackles, by which for a time it may have been bound to evil; and its capability, when by its own self-prompted energies it shall thus have emancipated itself, of making the first advances to God. Nothing, indeed, according to this gentleman, can be regarded as true and spiritual in religion, except what has its origin in, and is carried out by the inherent and indestructible liberty of, human volition. By the truth or falsehood, then, of this axiom, his system stands or falls. Now for the present we are content to waive all consideration of the fact, that in this assumption of our author's he is at issue with some of the greatest theologians and metaphysicians whose names adorn the pages of modern history; that Luther wrote his book *de servo arbitrio* in opposition to Erasmus, with the express object of exposing the baselessness of the theory; that Jonathan Edwards, in his immortal work, has with irresistible force and subtlety of reasoning, combated and overthrown it; and that Hume has left upon record ideas on the subject, which it might be worth while to refute, before coolly setting down the converse of his conclusions as true. Let all this be passed over. The Scriptures alone, without referring to the language of particular passages, and taking them merely in their broad and general averments, lay down principles, and proclaim facts, absolutely irreconcilable with Mr. Newman's postulate. Human will, according to them, is subject to human nature, And the dispositions and tendencies of human nature are not towards God, but from God. No doubt they represent human nature as endowed subjectively with a religious principle; but that a principle which, followed out, tends to the exaltation and deification of self, not to the recognition of him who

is the living and true God. Man worships, and necessarily worships, the creature, whenever his natural religious tendencies are stimulated, rather than the Creator, who is over all, blessed for ever. Scripture facts while they exemplify, are of the nature of practical conclusions from this principle. Hence the fall. Hence the growing impiety and iniquity of the antediluvian world. Hence the rapid and fearful plunge into idolatry which immediately succeeded the flood; and the moral and religious abominations of heathen countries, even amidst all their boasted learning and refinement. Hence the idolatrous and wicked conduct of the Israelites themselves, in every period of their eventful history. And, to travel for a moment out of the Scripture record, hence all the humiliating manifestations of mere human nature, in the matter of religion, from the period of the introduction of Christianity, down to the present day. The language of every one of these grand facts is uniform and unmistakable. They all as with one voice proclaim, not the liberty of man's will, but its bondage. Not its capability of extricating itself from the gulf of guilt and misery, but its tendency to plunge deeper and deeper therein. Not love to God, and a disposition to rise to heaven, on the part of man, but love to self, and to the state of degradation by which he is chained down to earth.—Another class of Scriptural facts, contrasted yet analogous, serve to confirm these conclusions. It was God who came to Adam, with a message of grace and love, immediately after his transgression—not Adam, filled with a sense of guilt, and overwhelmed with shame, who voluntarily came to God. It was God who made himself known to Abraham, while an idolator, dwelling in Ur of the Chaldees,—not Abraham who, stimulated by his own free will, and dashing aside every obstacle, rushed into the divine presence, and made himself the friend of God. It was God who in the fulness of time, and according to his eternal purpose, sent his Son into the world,—not men who drew nigh to God, in the character and capacity of their own saviours; and it was God who by means of the preaching of the apostles, "was found of them that sought him not,"—not Gentiles who, steeped in idolatry and every species of abomination, by previous acts of faith, and abnegation of evil practices, sought and obtained his favour. The facts of Scripture themselves thus presenting and embodying a principle the opposite of that contended for by Mr. Newman, need we wonder at the divine record constantly employing language in accordancy with these facts? *The world by wisdom knew not God.* Since God saw meet to make himself known, the disposition and practice of men have been *not to retain God in their knowledge*, but to *change the truth of God into a lie.* Nay, even when divine light had been embodied in the person of God's own Son, men, so far from welcoming it, would not come to it: *having loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.* Conformably still further to the facts of the case, it is by God, not by man, that any *are made willing in the day of power.* It is because the Son of man *makes* certain parties *free*, and not because they have either power or inclination to emancipate themselves, that they *become free indeed.* It is not as old creatures, or as human beings, but by *having the old man put off, and the new man put on*, or by being new created from above; it is not by any effort of their own will, but *by faith of the operation of God;* it is not by throwing off their own trammels, in the supposed plenitude of their voluntary freedom, but by the exercise of the same *mighty power that raised Jesus from the dead*, that any human beings obtain deliverance from the love and practice of ungodliness. And is not the experience of all who are competent to pronounce a right judgment on the matter, agreeable to this? Who that has had made known to him the truth as it is in Jesus, and has thereby come to understand what religious liberty means, will venture to ascribe in any respect whatever to the freedom of his own will, what he knows and feels to have poceeded from the exercise of freedom or sovereignty on the part of the will of God? *Video meliora proboque*, men ignorant of God, and under the condemnation of their own consciences, may, as possessed of a certain species of light, truthfully enough say; but *deteriora sequor*, if possessed

of any measure of self-knowledge and preserved from self-delusion, they will with equal truth be constrained to add. Man's will unquestionably must be free, in order to its possession and enjoyment of true and spiritual religion. But this freedom, as enslaved by its own nature and enslaved by sin, man cannot confer on himself. Every effort to do so, as it originates in ignorance and self-delusion, so must it terminate in failure and disappointment. Divine truth and love, manifested to the conscience and shed abroad in the heart, through faith in Christ Jesus, as bringing the individual under the power of the divine nature, constitute the only emancipating principles. A liberty of the will, and a power of man voluntarily to throw off sin and come to God, such as Mr. Newman contends for, have no existence except in his own imagination; and his book, as constructed on such ideal principles, falls to be classed with those literary dreams, of which the New Atlantis and the Utopia afford such choice and elegant specimens.

Such are a few of the assumptions upon which our author's theory rests, and such do I conceive to be their sufficient confutation. *Qualis ab incepto* is a brief but appropriate account of the manner in which he follows out an undertaking so auspiciously begun.

Perhaps we may be indulged in adducing at some length, proofs and illustrations of our charge.

In the first place, Mr. Newman argues, "that unless we have independent means of knowing, that *God knows the truth, and is disposed to tell it to us*, his word, (if we be ever so certain that it is his word,) might as well not have been written. But if we know, independently of the Bible, that God knows the truth, and is disposed to tell it to us, obviously we know a great deal more also. We know not only the existence of God, but much concerning his character." p. 58. Persons conversant with the Deistical controversy, as it was carried on in a former age, will not fail to recognize in the language just quoted, the substance, and that in a form not much altered, of the argument broached and insisted on by Tindal, in his "Christianity as old as the Creation." According to this antiquated and oft-refuted theory, the Scriptures communicate to us no new or divine information; but are merely to us, in so far as they are trustworthy, the republication and reassertion of principles, views and sentiments, with which our own faculties, if duly exercised, have already made us acquainted. And so, in the apprehension of Mr. Newman, divine revelation, in its essential and constituent elements, exists naturably in ourselves, instead of coming to us externally through the medium of the Scriptures, or of any other book. Strictly consistent, no doubt, all this is with a deification of the indefinite mind of man—the ascription to it, in its natural state, of spirituality—and the idea of its necessarily taking the initiative in all true and genuine religion. But is it—can it be true? Under such circumstances, it occurs to ask, what necessity or use for the Scriptures? *A revelation which reveals nothing*, is, we respectfully submit, no revelation at all. If, independently of the Scriptures, "we know not only the existence of God, but much concerning his character," had we not much better shut our bibles, and, like the Quakers, follow the guidance of that "light within us," which has already conducted us so far, and has hitherto been productive of so many and such important discoveries. *C'est le premier pas qui coute*, say our clever and sensible Gallic neighbours. If then without the aid of the Bible—indeed, as a necessary preliminary to our paying any respect to the Bible—we can find out for ourselves God's existence and so many of his attributes, why not prosecute the path so happily entered on, and find out the rest? Besides, even the very slender measure of respect which, on this system, is awarded to the Scriptures, is merely that of occasionally suggesting what, in order to its being received and acted on, requires the sanction of our own previously and otherwise enlightened minds. What is this, of course, but to constitute ourselves the judges *a priori* of what is, or is not suitable for God to reveal? With this presumptuous argument, we might leave the author of "The Analogy of Natural and Revealed Religion"

to deal. But going farther than that distinguished prelate, and denying, as we are satisfied the Scriptures themselves authorize us to do, the possibility of the existence of religion in any form, independently of the previous existence of express and verbal divine revelation, we prefer appealing at once to the sacred record. There we learn, that instead of leaving man, by dint of the exercise of his own faculties, to find out the existence of his Maker, express revelation was almost coeval with man's existence; God having in words made himself known to man, as soon as he had created him. Gen. ii. There also we learn, that man's guilt springs not from neglecting or opposing the light of his own self-taught mind, but from his violating intimations of conscience, or prescriptions of positive law, coming to him from without. Rom. ii, iii. Man, unquestionably, possesses, and in Scripture is represented as possessing a faculty, by which he is qualified to receive divine law, and to become the subject of religious impressions; these, however, the same authority shews us, come from without, not from within—from above, not from below—from direct revelation, or from traditionary notices founded on revelation, not in consequence of having been found out, or expiscated by ourselves. Ably and admirably *on the whole*, (for to a few minor points objections may be made,) is this subject treated of in Barclay's "Without Faith without God." God hath indeed *magnified his word above all his name*; Psalm cxxxviii; and this, by making it, either as originally spoken or as reduced to writing—either directly or indirectly—the source of every notion of himself, natural or supernatural, human or divine, that has ever entered into, or found a place in the mind of man. In sober seriousness, the existence of such a work as that of Mr. Newman, and of such views as those advocated in it, is most melancholy. The idea of notices of God having a place in the mind antecedently to express divine revelation,—independently of it,—and constituting the only foundation upon which it can legitimately rest, while in every age it has found its votaries, has perhaps for the last two centuries, been one of the masterpieces of Satan's delusions. Burns, the Scottish poet, following the meteor glare of genius into all those quagmires of sin and misery into which it plunged him, and confident all the while, that, "although it was leading him astray," it was nevertheless,

"a light from heaven,"

is not a more pitiable sight, than are men who, like Mr. Newman, after having turned their backs upon the true light from heaven, *the glory of God shining in the face of Jesus*, are content to mistake for it, and to abandon themselves to the pursuit of that *ignis fatuus*, "a light of God, shining naturally in their own minds." Thus acting—thus delighting themselves in light emitted by the sparks of a fire of their own kindling,—need we wonder at their living, and lying down ultimately in sorrow?

In the second place, almost as a corollary from what precedes, we find Mr. Newman employing his "natural light" as a means of enabling him to sit in judgment on the Scriptures. Opposed as these are on so many fundamental points to him, the result of their being constrained to appear at the bar of a tribunal, presided over by such a judge, could not be doubtful. To condemn them is indispensable to his own justification. Indeed, under the circumstances of such a trial, their condemnation is of the nature of a foregone conclusion.—To descend to particulars.—Paul was, it turns out, but a sorry metaphysician after all. No doubt, giving us "*the metaphysics and logic of the apostolic age*;" but metaphysics and logic which we do well to discard altogether as worthless. Our natural divine light enables us to expose his erroneous statements, and correct his syllogistic blunders; as well as to substitute for them something more accordant with science and fact. See especially from p. 218 to 254. Nay, to such a length does our author carry this hatred of his to the Pauline theories and metaphysics, as to pronounce it to be absolutely "*wicked* to sacrifice our understandings" to them, however emphatically they may claim to be divine.

p. 254. Following out his judgments on the convicted culprit, and applying the same principles to the morals of the Bible, which he had already applied to its doctrines, our author finds something not only wrong, but even disgusting and repellent in Scriptural morality. To do him justice, he is good enough to allow, that, in many cases, "conscience" may be "too dull to rise above the Bible." Thus, if not useful in enlightening and elevating, the Bible may not, as he conceives, be positively noxious. But he deprecates "*depressing* conscience to the Bible standard. This," he adds, "is done to a fatal extent by thousands, in regard to the Old Testament, and by hundreds in regard to the New."—p. 62. And to differ from Mr. Newman, in preferring scripture doctrines, and scripture morals to his own, is, forsooth, Bibliolatry, or Bible worship. That is, while the greatest latitude is allowed to the worship of "the light within," which to whatever lengths it may conduct us, and in whatever consequences it may involve us, is to be scrupulously followed—to exhibit the slightest regard to the language or dictates of Scripture, until after we shall have asked and obtained the sanction of our internal and infallible oracle, is to be guilty of idolizing the Scriptures! Truly, this is lamentable. It almost leads one to question the sanity of the mind from which such ideas could proceed. Hitherto even open infidels have professed to regard as exhibiting the highest *ideal* of purity and excellence, the morals of the New Testament, especially as these are detailed and enforced in the 5th, 6th and 7th chapters of Matthew; and to find in the words of Paul, Romans xiii., *love worketh no ill to his neighbour, therefore love is the fulfilling of the law*, something like a perfect compendium of all that can be said on the subject. But, nowadays *nous avons changé tout cela.* Prophetical and apostolic morality must now, as in many respects proved to be defective and dangerous, yield to that of German, and Germanizing divines! Still we confess to having a strong predilection for the former. Looking at Psalm cxix., and considering the unreserved devotedness to God, and love to his law, combined with perfect abstinence from evil in thought, feeling, and desire, as well as acts, which it breathes and manifests throughout—we do not need to say who is the speaker, to any spiritually enlightened man—we have a shrewd suspicion, that "notwithstanding the thousands of instances" in which to inculcate Old Testament morality, would be to "*depress*" the minds of men to a standard inferior to their own, we have in this Psalm an elevation of understanding, and a purity of heart displayed, the most distant approach to which it would puzzle Mr. Newman to point out in any living example.

(*To be concluded in our next.*)

The Great Redemption: an Essay on the Mediatorial System. By William Leask. *London: B. L. Green.* 1849.

It is not our purpose to enter into a lengthened analysis of this volume, in which is propounded a theory *essentially* consistent with current notions of the chief doctrines of Christianity. We deny the appropriateness of the term "Great Redemption," to the system contended for by our author,—a system which represents the creature as capable of frustrating the Creator,—which denies the universal efficacy of the atonement,—and maintains the everlasting perpetuation of sin and suffering. Our author, however, has some indefinite idea of the vastness and sublimity of his theme, and is carried occasionally beyond himself, and the limits, which, in other parts of his work, he assigns to the "Great Redemption." We quote the following truthful and eloquent passage as corroborative of our remark.

"In his letter to the Ephesians, the apostle Paul says that God hath 'made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed

in himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth.' . . . . What is contemplated by this eternal purpose, 'according to' which, as a plan, rule, or arrangement, God unfolds his majestic designs? It is a necessary idea that he has a purpose; the mind must adopt it; and from the character of the Being of whom this is affirmed, that purpose must be eternal. . . . And now an examination of the ultimate design of the system of redemption leads to the question, What did this eternal purpose in Christ Jesus contemplate? The Scriptures teach that God, who created all things by Jesus Christ, designed—'to the intent,' that is, with the purpose in view—that the creation of the world and of men, and the salvation of the latter, should be parts of *one grand scheme*, processes in the working out of *one* magnificent design which should fill eternity with its fame, and exhibit to the principalities and powers in heavenly places his manifold wisdom; and that the whole universe of mind and matter should be the everlasting exposition of the being and attributes of God to his immortal family. He has been writing his own history in worlds, in stars, suns, and systems; by mind, soul, and spirit; by revelation, law, and grace; by Jesus Christ and moral recovery through him; and by the operation of the Holy Spirit, down to the present moment. He is writing that glorious history still. It is the text-book of the intelligent creation. Every mind in every world must read it. Every volition of his will is a line added to the universal bible; and every act of his providence is an additional step towards the sublime issue contemplated by him who 'worketh hitherto.' Of that great 'book of Jehovah' many chapters have yet to be written. It is far from complete. The 'groanings' of creation have not yet ceased. 'The restitution of all things' has not yet been accomplished. . . The world purchased as a possession by the blood which fell upon it in the garden of Gethsemane, has not yet laid its treasures at its owner's feet. 'We see not yet all things put under' the representative of man. The Redeemer's sabbath has not yet dawned upon the universe. Still, his Spirit moves upon the troubled mass. Still his voice is directed to 'the cities of the nations.' Still the cry is heard, 'O earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord!' But still the evolving process is going on; there is no intermission; no cessation; no abandonment of the eternal purpose; 'for the vision is yet for an appointed time; but at the end it shall speak and not lie;' for

> "'Jehovah of hosts, hath sworn, saying,
> Surely as I have devised so shall it be;
> And as I have counselled, that shall stand;
> Jehovah of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it?
> And His hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?'

"The epithalamium predicted shall therefore yet be sung. This world shall be hailed as the star-gem on the Redeemer's brow. Angels and men shall be re-created under Him. The Elder-born shall have 'the pre-eminence.' Death shall travail in birth with the resurrection, and die when it is delivered. 'Every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess' to Christ. Demons shall own his supremacy. All worlds shall acknowledge him the centre of the moral universe. God will be glorified in his Son, and all that has been noted as 'not yet,' will take place, each in order, and and all in the time appointed by the Father, ere the eternal purpose be fully realized. Childish is that theology which speaks of adverse currents in the stream of manifested God. There are none. All things are co-operating. 'The day shall declare it.' Time is eternity in motion. Man is God's 'workmanship.' Worlds are heaven's hieroglyphics. Meagre is that creed which limits the great Redemption to a few men. Calvary has more lessons than one. Christ is the centre of Calvary; Calvary of the Church; the Church of the world; and the world of the universe; so that Christ is all and in all, the centre, sun, substance, life, and end of all being!" (p. 303—307.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

Sir,—I should esteem it as a favour if you would give me an opportunity of directing the attention of your readers to the subject of the following communication, by giving it insertion in your pages.

During last session of Parliament there was brought in, "A Bill to enable persons

who refuse on religious grounds to be sworn, to substitute an Affirmation for an Oath." It was therein provided that such persons should go before a justice of the peace, with one credible witness as to character, and make a statement of their objection, when they would receive a certificate entitling them to the privilege proposed, on any subsequent occasion. Measures, having a similar object, had been introduced and made some progress on several occasions previously, and the bill of last session passed the Commons but was rejected by the Lords. It is expected that Mr. W. Page Wood, who took charge of the Bill last session, will introduce a similar measure during the ensuing one, and it is with the view of procuring support for the measure that I now address you.

To no class of individuals can we look with better reason for support than to Evangelical Universalists. All oaths are expressly prohibited by the Lord Jesus Christ, (Matt. v. 33—37 and James v. 12) and that on the ground that they involve a pledge, on the part of the person who swears, of something beyond his controul. Oaths are instituted and valued by society on account of their affording or being supposed to afford a greater security for truth than any other form of solemn declaration, because they involve an imprecation or prayer for a curse upon himself by the person making the declaration, if he fail in what he has engaged to do. "So help me God," constitutes the essence of the oath, and the meaning of it is simply this,—may God damn me if I do not perform what I have promised. In common phrase, the swearer stakes his salvation for the performance of his promise. Such an engagement, made by any one who believes that salvation is the result of God's unconditional mercy only, indicates the grossest inconsistency; he is giving utterance to words which in his mouth have no meaning, and is imposing on society with a falsehood, as he is leading his fellow men to suppose that he believes his salvation to depend on something he can do. To those who know his professed sentiments he is destroying the value of his testimony to the truth; and confirming, (and with justice too,) in their opposition to his doctrine, all who believe that the salvation of God is in any way conditional; for he affords them practical evidence of the force of the objection, which perhaps of all others has most weight with them, that his doctrine encourages him to follow the dictates of his own natural and selfish inclinations, by releasing him from all restraint and leading him to licentiousness. To those who are ignorant of his sentiments, he is neglecting an opportunity of proclaiming the love of God to man in a way which strikes their attention much more forcibly than from a pulpit or a book. He is, moreover, violating the dictates of his own conscience, and incurring that righteous retribution which inevitably follows all transgression, whether he foresee it or not.

Many individuals have been subjected to grievous hardships, and undeserved suffering for refusing to swear on conscientious grounds; many of these have so acted, on much lower principles than those upon which I make the present appeal. It is to remedy these evils that Parliament is to be petitioned to interfere, by enacting some such measure as that I have alluded to, and it is to invoke the assistance of all the readers of this magazine, who maintain the right of liberty of conscience, that I have sought to address them. Last year numerous petitions were sent from Scotland in support of the Bill, and a few from England; it is earnestly to be desired that it should be still more universally supported in the approaching session. Some sects in this country, viz., Quakers, Moravians, and Separatists are already entitled by law, to the privilege sought for. In the United States of America it is optional with witnesses to employ oath or affirmation in giving evidence, and no evil results from it. May we hope that there will not be wanting in England, amongst those who maintain that salvation is the gift of God, some who are willing to bestow a little time and trouble in assisting to procure an equivalent alteration in the laws of this country.

I am, Sir,

With much respect and esteem, yours,

Liverpool, Jan. 16, 1850. D. W.

P.S.—To those willing to interest themselves in this matter, it may be useful to know that in the House of Commons, (besides Mr Wood,) Sir E. N. Buxton and the Hon. Mr. Bouverie have interested themselves in the cause; and in the House of Peers, Lord Denman, Lord Campbell, and the Duke of Argyle have warmly and ably supported it. Mr. James Brown, the Secretary to the Edinburgh and Leith Anti-Oath Association, has been indefatigable in his exertions for the cause, and the writer of this also will be ready to give any further information in his power to parties desiring it, who may be brought into communication with him through Mr. Lewis, the publisher of this magazine. Copies of a Tract treating of the subject, briefly yet fully, will be given gratuitously to those who are willing to exert themselves in diffusing information on the subject, and procuring signatures to petitions to Parliament.

THE UNIVERSALIST.

MARCH, 1850.

ON THE WORDS αιων AND αιωνιος.

There are perhaps no instances in which the sense of Scripture is so much obscured as by the mistranslation of these words: so much so, that to this cause the doctrine of endless torment is to be chiefly attributed. It is now generally admitted, that they do not signify *endless duration*. Doctor Lee, in his recent work on Prophecy, speaking of the terms αιων, αιωνες, αιωνες των αιωνων, and the like, says they "primarily and properly denote some indefinite part, portion, or portions of time, and may, by a metonomy, signify certain things connected with one or another of these; but that, in no case, the *physical world* is meant: while the period of occurrence, or of duration, of any of these portions, &c., must be ascertained from the circumstances of the context." p. 136. This being the case, any translations different in degree or kind from these must be erroneous. Αιων is, strictly and literally, *an age*. It is, however, as respectively singular or plural, often translated "world" or "worlds"—"for ever"—"for ever and ever"—and, in two instances, "eternal." Αιωνιος, being an adjective derived from αιων, is, strictly and literally, *of* or *belonging to an age* or *ages;* but it is mostly translated "eternal" or "everlasting." For more particularity, see "The Englishman's Concordance to the New Testament." The confusion thus created is so extensive as to render its removal, not only desirable, but imperative. There is no difficulty in the case of αιων, as our word *age* (except in one to be hereafter noticed) exactly represents it; but we have not any adjective, derived from *age*, to represent αιωνιος. *Eternal*, being analogously derived from *ætas*, had most probably, at first, the same signification as αιωνιος; but, having long been synonymous with *endless*, is no longer a translation of it. We have, however, a good substitute: we have another derivative from *ætas* in the word *etaneous*, which, as exactly corresponding to αιωνιος, supplies the best possible translation of it; which, though used only in the compound *co-etaneous*, is equally wanted,—for this purpose, much more wanted,—in our language; and which therefore, it is hoped, will be adopted by all who wish to exhibit truth in its native purity.

It is readily admitted, that the epithet αιωνιος is annexed to things essentially imperishable: to God,—to the life and reign of Christ and his saints,—to the new covenant, or laws written in the heart. But, even in these instances, it retains its proper meaning, and so expresses their RELATION, not to a future state, but to the present. The same remark applies to αιων; and that mundane ages are denoted by both terms is clear from the phrases απ' αιωνος, προ των αιωνων, προ χρονων αιωνιων, and the like.

It may, however, be satisfactory to examine a few places more particularly.

Αιωνιος is thought to express endless duration when joined with θεος; but without reason. As God is called "the King of the ages," in 1 Tim. i. 17, he is equivalently called "the etaneous God," in Rom. xvi. 26. The Spirit also is called "the etaneous Spirit," in Heb. ix. 14, from his special ministration during the then-existing age.—See 2 Cor. iii. 8.

The application of αιωνιος to "life," which occurs so often in the New Testament, is explained by the different, but equivalent, construction in Dan. xii. 2, which foretels it. "And many of the sleepers of earth dust shall awake: some (לחיי עולם) to the life of the age, and some (לחרפות לדראון עולם) to the shame, to the reproach, of the age." That this is the strict rendering is evident from the word חיי, "life," being *in regimine*,* and from the words "shame" and "contempt" being in similar position. Our Lord calls this awaking a resurrection to life or to condemnation or judgment, in John v. 28, 29, apparently referring to this passage, and to Ezek. xxxvii. 11—14; and Paul uses both terms: "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light."—Eph. v. 14. The age, then, is the Messianic age,—the age when Christ, our life, was manifested; and when "life and incorruption" were pre-eminently "brought to light by the Gospel," (2 Tim. i. 10,†) which life is accordingly defined by our Lord with especial reference to himself. "This is etaneous life, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent."—John xvii. 3.

Death, on the other hand, is often applied to the carnal mind, which all inherit from Adam; and which, in this sense, is contrasted with the spiritual mind derived from Christ. "To be carnally minded is death,

* I add, for the information of the English reader, that a noun, which governs a genitive, is said, by Hebrew grammarians, to be *in regimine*, or construction; and that masculines plural, in this position, drop their final ם. Thus חיי, if not in regimine, would be חיים. The plural form of this word, for the singular, is idiomatic.

† In this text, the Apostle speaks of *the grace* or *favour which was given*, or *promised*, (see Tit. i. 2) *to us in Christ Jesus before the world began*, φανερωθεισαν δε νυν, *but is now* made manifest, δια της επιφανειας *by the* appearance *of our Saviour Jesus Christ*, (comp. 1 Tim. iii. 16, 1 Pet. i. 19, 20,) *who hath* actually *overcome death*, namely, by his death, (comp. Heb. ii. 14,) *and hath* brought *life and incorruption* to light *by the gospel*, i. e. not the *doctrine*, but the *thing*: Christ, by *actually rising* from the dead, and causing this important *fact*, as fulfilled in and by Him, to be published by the gospel.—Parkhurst, under Φωτιζω, IV.

but to be spiritually minded is life and peace."—Rom. viii. 6. Hence, though the Adamic nature is not better in believers than in others, and though subject, in like manner, to the original sentence of natural death, they are said to "have passed from death to life," and "not to see death;" because the higher spiritual life conferred on them cannot be lost.—John v. 24, viii. 51, x. 28, 29. These remarks are applicable to such other words as ἀπολεια, *destruction, perdition,* ὀλεθρος, *destruction,* &c., by which the *temporal* condition and end of the ungodly are distinguished from that of the saints.

How misconceived then, in every particular, the oft-repeated argument, for which Matt. xxv. 46 is the assumed foundation! The same eternity, we are told, is assigned to the final states both of reward and punishment. Not the same *eternity*, but the same *etaneity;* not final states at all; and, according to the current use of κολασις, here translated "punishment," the sense is very different from the "damnation" of orthodoxy. Grotius says, (in his work *De Jure Belli et Pacis*, Book II. § vii. 1, 2,) that the kind of punishment, which tends to the improvement of the criminal, is what is called by philosophers, among other terms, κολασις, or *chastisement;* in proof of which observation, he quotes the following passage from Xenophon to the soldiers. Ει μεν επ' αγαθῳ εκολασα τινα, αξιω ὑπεχειν δικην, οἱαν και γονεις υἱοις, και διδασκαλοι παισιν· και γαρ ἱατροι τεμνουσιν επ' αγαθῳ. If I have chastised any one for his good, I count him worthy of such punishment as parents inflict on their children, and teachers on their pupils: and surgeons even cut patients for their good. *De Exped. Cyr.* Lib. v. c.8, § 8. Ed. Oxon. This passage from Grotius has been produced by others; but iterated objections require iterated refutation. The noun occurs in but one other place, 1 John iv. 18; and the verb in Acts iv. 21, and 2 Pet. ii. 9. So far indeed is Scripture from asserting endless punishment, that all those negative terms, which can alone properly and unequivocally express it, and which are used on other occasions, appear to be purposely avoided. Such are ουκ εσται τελος, *no end*, Luke i. 33,—ακαταλυτος, *indissoluble*, Heb. vii. 16,—απειρωντος, *interminable*, 1 Tim. i. 4,—αφθαρτος, *incorruptible*, 1 Pet. i. 4. The doctrine is thus destitute of every description of proof.

In one place, αιων is applied to the post-resurrection state, as contrasted with the present: Luke xx. 34, 35. This the context clearly shows; but all other contexts as clearly restrict it to some time or times of the latter. The phrase εις τον αιωνα, *to the age*, seems to indicate some *definite* period, probably the predicted judgment on the nations; (Is. xxxiv. 1—3, Joel iii. 11—14) but as that period, till its arrival, was unknown, the phrase, in popular usage, came to signify *indefinite* futurity.

In sum: a clear and distinct view of the dispensations, and often of the things respectively belonging to the seen and unseen world, can never be attained so long as the words "eternal" and "everlasting" are indiscriminately used for both limited and unlimited duration. Let these words be used as synonymes of "endless;" but let "age" and "etaneous" be appropriated to αιων and αιωνιος.

R. R.

TRUE CHRISTIANITY A PRACTICAL RELIGION.

ARTICLE I.

Religion, or the knowledge of a superior power, and of man's relation to that power, has always been regarded by the great majority of mankind as a practical subject. By a few, the Deity may have been considered as little more than an intellectual abstraction,—a being entirely absorbed in the contemplation of his own perfections, or at least not concerning or connecting himself with the affairs of men. Such, whether calling themselves philosophers or not, can scarcely be regarded as having a religion at all; they are but sceptics; they would, but cannot say, "There is no God." But the great mass of mankind have ever regarded the superior powers as interesting themselves in the affairs of men; and, whether they have acknowledged one or many gods, have always attributed to them the functions of a governor,—the legislative, the judicial, and the executive; and, in accordance with this, have recognized in their deities the will to make laws, the wisdom to judge of their observance, and the power to punish for the neglect of them.

Such a view of the Deity cannot fail to exert an influence on the conduct of men, and that in proportion to the estimate they form of the purity of his character and the greatness of his power. Indeed, for such results is religion valued among men, and upon its influence in producing these do its teachers rest its claims for support. And, as a consequence of this, under all religious systems, except that which reveals God as at peace with the guilty, men, more or less conscious of imperfection, seek in religion the means of obtaining the assistance or propitiating the favour of their god, as sources of that consolation and hope of which they feel themselves in need.

Nor is it wonderful that men should thus look upon religion; nay, it is reasonable that they should do so. For whether we consider religion as the result of human discoveries of the character and purposes of God, or as his own revelation of these to men, corrupted or not; whether we think of God as unenlightened men picture him, even such a one as themselves, or see him as he has declared himself to be,—even Love itself; still it may be shown that such views are all, though in different ways, calculated or intended to exert an influence on human conduct.

Let us consider this first in respect to false religious systems; and, neglecting the grosser forms of these, let us confine our observations to what are nominally Christian. In these God is regarded as seeking his own glory, and making his works of creation and providence subservient to that purpose; but, ignorant that his nature is but the expression of his Sovereign will, the advocates of these systems regard his will merely as the manifestation of his nature, and therefore, though they may acknowledge this to be love, they find his purposes liable to be counteracted and controlled by the wills or natures of other intelligent beings. God is willing, nay desirous they tell us, to be merciful to all, but alas! men will not accept of his mercy or believe in his declarations. Or, another class find his nature under the control of a higher power, that of inflexible inexorable Necessity. God is love, they tell

us, but (for anything we know, they say,) it may be *necessary* that some of his creatures be passed by in his purpose of mercy, and predestinated to eternal misery for their sins, to the praise of his glorious justice, or more correctly we shall say for them, be yielded up to the superior god, Fate. These are the two grand divisions of spurious Christianity: the one recognizing a Deity greatly benevolent, but liable to be counteracted by his own creatures; the other holding a God under the control of a cold, dark, and dismal Destiny. These religious systems are necessarily practical: the one teaches its votaries by all means to seek the assistance, and endeavour to propitiate the favour, of their God; the other incites them to discover, or rather to persuade themselves into the belief, that they are special favourites of the Deity. The latter is scarcely adapted to general capacities, and not sufficiently practical in its tendencies; so it is combined with the former in various ways, to constitute the various shades of doctrine recognized as evangelical orthodoxy.

In true Christianity, on the other hand, God is seen as manifested in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself. Those to whom his true character is revealed know him as just, and the justifier of the ungodly; for they know that Jesus the Son of God, by his death and resurrection, has made an end of sin and brought in everlasting righteousness. They now know God as love; they believe that he has loved them with an everlasting love, and will continue to love them with a love that is unchangeable. They know that he cares for them and watches over them, and sends them benefits and visits them with sufferings: that his care extends to them even when, having left them to manifest the evil that is in their nature, he punishes them for their wickedness. They know that as surely as they inherit death from Adam, so surely are they heirs of life through Christ. God's purpose in the work of Creation and Providence, it is true, is his own glory: but, as Love is his very nature, his glory is identified with the conferring of happiness on his creatures; and, as he is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, and will by no means clear the guilty, it is also identified with the manifestation of his justice in punishing the guilty, in rewarding every man according to his works, in inflicting upon all the wages of sin, that is, death. But much more are his justice and mercy both manifested in the way in which he destroys both sin and death,—by the glorious appearing of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel. For he hath made him to be sin (or a sin-offering) for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.

This, the glad tidings of the mercy of God, is also a practical religion, as much as any of the spurious gospels which find more favour with men. It is true, that it relieves those who believe it from all fears of eternal existence in misery, for it gives them a good, that is, an assured hope of salvation through Christ, by revealing to them eternal life as the *gift* of God through his Son; as much his gift, as little dependent upon anything they have done or may do, as the life they at present possess. But, while not dependent on this life, it is nevertheless connected with it. Though we have but a very imperfect idea of the extent and importance of the connection, we know this at least,

that it has been made the medium of communicating to us the knowledge of good and evil, and of affording an opportunity for the manifestation of some of the highest attributes of the Almighty, in bringing good out of evil; and we know not to how much it may be made subservient hereafter, even as the saints of old remained long in darkness, before the revelation of the present dispensation, the mystery which was hid from ages and from generations.

The knowledge of the truth relieves from that fear which hath torment; and thus stands blessedly distinguished from systems which cultivate that fear, that is, an apprehension of the everlasting wrath of God. It also sweeps away all grounds of self-dependence, whether openly declared or devoutly ascribed to God's grace, in the hope of reward for, or connected with, anything man can do; for it declares eternal life to be God's free gift, entirely irrespective of anything in man, whether good or evil. It therefore stands in the eyes of the world, especially the religious world, a system without motives or sanctions, at least without sufficient ones; imposing no restraint on men's evil inclinations, holding out no inducements for their repression, or for the cultivation of good ones. But this is a false and erroneous accusation.

The gospel of the grace of God does not, like infidel systems, simply remove restraint from men's evil inclinations, leaving a blank, or at most merely human restraints in its place: it relieves from one restraining influence by substituting a new motive,—the generous principle of love for the selfish one of fear; gratitude for blessings bestowed, instead of hope of blessings to be gained, or curses to be incurred. It is true that human beings are essentially selfish, and benefits conferred often produce little gratitude; there is therefore an apprehension in the minds of many, that such motives will possess very little influence, and that accordingly such doctrine cannot be relied upon for exercising much practical influence on mankind in general. This is true; but waving for the present any consideration of its effects on mankind in general, we have only to consider the influence of such motives on those who understand and believe the testimony which reveals God's mercy to sinners: they alone can exercise this love to him, because they only know that God hath first loved them. But it is not to be forgotten that their nature remains unchanged: they have a new principle implanted in them through belief of the truth, and to that extent are partakers of the divine nature; but this does not change or improve their natural principles; it wars against them, and in proportion as it operates, overcomes them. But while the knowledge of the love of God imparts to them joy unspeakable and full of glory, the practical influence which it directly exerts on the conduct of believers while they are possessed of mortal bodies, would be insufficient for the purposes for which God has placed them in the world. Conditionality is essential to humanity: rewards and punishments are absolutely necessary to the maintenance and regulation of the relations in which men stand to one another. Under these the Christian is placed like other men: if he do well, he will gain his reward; if ill, he will incur his punishment. These however are neither eternal happiness nor eternal misery; he will be rewarded according as his work shall be, according to the award of him who searcheth the heart,—the Lord who judgeth righteously.

True Christianity therefore supplies all the motives to influence the conduct that false religion does, and something more. The rewards and punishments which it proposes are appropriate to their causes; not out of all proportion, as eternal and infinite consequences are to the actions of limited creatures during a temporary dispensation. They therefore do not suggest that practical doubt of the certainty of this award that the others do, and are therefore better calculated to produce the desired effects. It also inspires that filial confidence in God's truth and gratitude for his love, arising out of the certainty of the fulfilment of his promises, which no doubting system can ever afford. If these sanctions and influences appear insufficient, the fault may be traced to the perversions of its opponents, or the imperfections and inconsistencies of its professors. True Christianity, like its author, is perfect; its apparent imperfections exist only in the beings to whom it is addressed. To the elucidation of the causes of these we shall next direct our attention.

D. W.

ON SCRIPTURE PARALLELISM.

As the form, or method, of every well written composition is adapted to its matter, a due degree of attention to the former is necessary to a full apprehension of the latter. This peculiarity of adaptation, as exhibited in the holy Scriptures, has been systematically explained, under the name of Parallelism, by writers of acknowledged eminence; but, though their works have been long before the public, and notwithstanding the manifest utility of this branch of Biblical study, both have latterly fallen into reprehensible neglect. For myself, I can say, that there are questions, on which, without its aid, I never could have obtained a satisfactory solution; and, as I hope to lay some of them before the reader, I shall here, for the sake of the uninitiated, give a short preparative view of it.

Bishop Lowth, in the Preface to his Isaiah, has given numerous examples of Parallelism, which he arranges under three classes: synonymous, antithetic, and synthetic. All his examples, however, are taken from portions of the Old Testament, which he considers poetical; and so much in each other's vicinity as to be included in a few lines—seldom more than seven or eight. Bishop Jebb, in a work entitled "Sacred Literature," has produced many similar examples from the New Testament, but still within the same confined limits. Lastly, Mr. Boys, in his two works, entitled "Tactica Sacra" and a "Key to the Psalms," has fully shown that Parallelism pervades every part of the Sacred Writings,—whole books, psalms, epistles, and every part of them, *considered* as a whole, or integral part, consisting of subordinate parts, till we descend to the least and last; and, when the parallel or corresponding parts are *visibly* distinguished by their position, they are perceived, almost at a glance, to throw such light on each other as makes the Bible, in a pre-eminent degree, ITS OWN INTERPRETER.

This extended view of the subject requires a more extended classification, which naturally embraces the following genera and species.

1. Extent.	Extreme.	Greatest.	
		Least.	
	Intermediate.	Greater.	
		Less.	
2. Form.	Direct.	A, *A*, B, *B*.	of three or more members.
	Alternate.	A, B, *A*, *B*.	
	Introverted.	A, B, *A*; or A, B, *B*, *A*.	
3. Matter.	Identical.		
	Similar.		
	Antithetic.		
4. Circumstances.	Attached or dependent.		
	Detached or independent.		
	Local.		

There are also some minuter distinctions coming under the Similar and Antithetic species: namely, Proximate and Remote, Strict and Free, Duplicated, Concatenated, &c.

EXAMPLES.

Direct.

a | Of gold,
a | and of silver,
b | and of precious stones,
b | and of pearls. (Rev. xviii. —12—)

Alternate.

a | And of cotton,
b | and of purple,
a | and of silk,
b | and of scarlet. (Rev. xviii. —12—)

Introverted.

a | Of most precious wood.
b | and of brass,
b | and of iron,
a | and of marble. (Rev. xviii. —12—)

Identical and similar.

a | The voice of Jehovah
b | is powerful,
a | the voice of Jehovah
b | is majestic. (Ps. xxix. 4.)

Antithetic.

a | A false balance
b | is an abomination to Jehovah,
a | but a just weight
b | is his delight. (Prov. xi. 1.)

Here it may be conveniently observed, that what Mr. Boys calls Common References are produced by the omission of identical portions. Thus the full expression in the following passage,

Here is
the patience
of the saints,
and here is
the faith
of the saints.

is reduced, by such omission, to the form in which we find it.

Here is { the patience / and the faith } of the saints. (Rev. xiii. —10.)

Indeed, as repetition retards communication, it is never introduced into good writing but for some special purpose, such as emphasis, beauty, or precision.

In general, all the species are more or less intermixed, as in the following

Psalm: viz. A, B, *A*, the greatest parts, and an introversion—a, *a*, b, c, *b*, *c*, d, e, f, *d*, *e*, *f*, intermediate and alternate—enumerations in e, *e*, least and direct—A, *A*, f, *f*, identical—&c.

Psalm cxlviii.

A | Praise Jah.
B | a | b | d | Praise Jehovah from the heavens, praise him in the heights.
e | Praise him, all his angels;
praise him, all his hosts;
praise him, sun and moon;
praise him, all stars of light.
praise him, { heavens of heavens, and waters above the heavens.
f | Let them praise the name of Jehovah.
c | For { he commanded and they were created, and he hath established them for ever and ever, he hath given them a decree which shall not be transgressed.
a | *b* | *d* | Praise Jehovah from the earth,
e | dragons and all deeps, fire and hail, snow and vapour, stormy wind, } fulfilling his word;
mountains and all hills,
fruitful trees and all cedars;
beasts and all cattle,
reptiles and winged birds;
kings of the earth and all nations,
princes and all judges of the earth;
both young men and virgins,
old men and children.
f | Let them praise the name of Jehovah.
c | For { his name only is exalted, his glory is above the earth and heavens; and he has raised up { a horn for his people, a praise { for all his saints, for the sons of Israel, a people near to him.
A | Praise Jah.

Topics.

A | Gen.
B | Par. | a Heaven. | b | Exhortation. | d | Second person.
e | Enumeration.
f | Third person.
c | Motives.
a Earth. | *b* | Exhortation. | *d* | Second person.
e | Enumeration.
f | Third person.
c | Motives.
A | Gen.

These few specimens, however, can give a very inadequate idea of its utility. On this point Mr. Boys thus expresses himself: "Lastly, come the results

and inferences, the facts being previously established. When I consider the importance of these results, thought and language fail me."—*Tac. Sac.* p. 69. Again, "I have never before derived so much solid benefit and satisfaction from the Scriptures as I now derive. I have never before found them so profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. We learn, in the course of such studies, to grapple with every text as Jacob grappled with the angel: saying, I will not let thee go except thou bless me; unless I get something out of thee, we do not part. We learn not to cast away the fruits of the sacred vine, as formerly, after the first crush; but to continue crushing and pressing as long as we can make them yield a drop, and we often find the last drop the sweetest."—*Ibid.* p. 70.

To this testimony I most cordially subjoin my own. I consider it as the most effective instrument that has yet been put into our hands; that it is capable of turning the scale on most doubtful questions, doctrinal or critical; that by its means the reader often obtains, from bare inspection, a clearer and more comprehensive view of a subject, than from long and elaborate Commentaries; that he is often led to inferences and reflections, which otherwise would never have occurred to him; and that, till an arrangement agreeable to it of the entire volume of Scripture is completed, we shall not make the nearest possible approach either to the best translation, or to the most correct interpretation.

I read the works of Bishop Lowth and Bishop Jebb with much interest and profit; but so transcendent were the effects of Mr. Boys's works, that, in reading them, I rejoiced "as one that findeth great spoil;" and the eventual consequence of this feeling was An Analytical Arrangement of the whole Bible, which has been long ready for the press, and of which the publication only waits for public encouragement. (*See Prospectus on the cover.*)

R. R.

REVIEWS.

The Soul; her Sorrows and her Aspirations. By Francis William Newman, formerly Fellow of Baliol College, Oxford. Second Edition. London: *John Chapman, Strand.* 1849.

(*Continued from p.* 46.)

In the third place, having succeeded as he supposes in depreciating the character of the Scriptures, as teachers of doctrines and enforcers of morals, our author's next step is, consistently enough, to assail one of their grand and essential principles. "There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus," had said the apostle Paul, in strict accordancy with the Old Testament from first to last, as well as with the nature and object of the mission of him whose representative he was. No matter, argues our author. Mediation must at all costs and hazards be put down. Man must be taught in all his religious transactions and exercises to come directly to the Deity himself. He may, to be sure, without any violation of this rule, sist himself in the immediate presence of Jesus, as God; but as he values the

interests of truth, and his own peace of mind, all ideas of Jesus as Mediator must from such an act be carefully and thoroughly excluded. This is no mere inference of ours; no strained conclusion forced on reluctant premises. It is broadly, unhesitatingly, and frequently averred by Mr. Newman, with great variety of phrase, especially in his second chapter, in which he treats of "the sense of sin." See pp. 74—80. To the doctrine of mediation, as laid down in the writings of Paul, are traced by our author some of the most monstrous dogmas, and some of the worst practical exhibitions of modern religion: a direct intercourse between the soul and God being his sole and appropriate remedy for all such evils. The individual tortured by a sense of guilt, who has found all other expedients to get rid of it unavailing, is, abandoning every idea of mediation—indeed, regarding the whole system as noxious and loathsome,—to make "an unreserved exposure of the heart to the eye of God. This is the desirable consummation to which all the previous distress was preparatory; and nearly all that distress might perhaps have been avoided, if the man had been better taught. Yet no one can say how much severe goading one or another may need before he dares to rush as it were straight into God's presence, consciously unfaithful and uncleansed. To many a man perhaps his own act is as one of desperation. He faces that bright and pure Sun, which seems to scorch his eyes, and says: 'Slay me, O God, if thou wilt; I deserve it; I am miserable, but leave me not sinful thus. Put me to shame: I *am* shameful. Behold, I hide nothing.* Thou art light: expose my darkness. I will not palliate. I am worse than I know. Show me all that I am. I cannot heal myself. If I must die, I will die in Thy light.'" So awful is the state of mind betrayed in all this, that we have preferred giving it in Mr. Newman's own words, to attempting any abstract of our own. Following up the language quoted, he exclaims, "O the wonderful simplicity of Faith!" Faith in what? In direct divine testimony,? In a declaration emanating from higher and competent authority, that sin hath been taken away, and that God, for reasons satisfactory to himself, hath received us graciously, and loved us freely? O, no such thing. We must not go out of ourselves for the groundwork of the faith to which our author ascribes such marvellous efficacy. It is in *the suggestions of our own minds* that we are to believe. It is in the dictates of our own consciences, in the tendencies of our own emotions, enlightened and influenced by our own previous self-education, not in testimony borne through the medium of any writings whatever, that we are to repose implicit confidence. Is it possible to conceive a state of mind more fearfully realizing that described in 2 Thess. ii. 9—12, than this? Those who do not receive the love of THE TRUTH, or of God's word, in order to their salvation, are by God himself delivered over to strong delusion, (ἐνέργειαν πλάνης,) a process of judicial infliction which uniformly results in their believing THE LIE, or mere creature authority in matters of religion, even when that contradicts the authority of the Creator. Refusing to believe *the true*, which is the emanation of light and love, they are thrown on the belief of *the false*, or the suggestions of their own sinful and impure, their own dark and delusive understandings. "Yet true it is, and of verity," as our Scottish neighbours say in their criminal indictments. Mr. Newman recommends, nay urges on the soul conscious of guilt and filled with self-upbraidings, not belief in the atonement of Christ, or confidence derived from discovering his divine righteousness to be the only righteousness in which, guilty as it is, it can find favour and acceptance with God, but a rush—a desperate rush—with all its sin and guilt cleaving to it, and well nigh overwhelming it, into the immediate presence of THE MOST PURE. His mode of getting rid of "the sense of sin," is for the soul to fling itself, —apart from all theories of mediation, nay, with the utmost abhorrence of such theories as necessarily interfering with the act to be performed, and its due success—into the arms and embraces of God. This, according to him, is true

* By the way, did our author take this idea from the beginning of Rousseau's "Confessions?"

faith. This, and this only, according to him, ensures the accomplishment of our purpose. An act of pure unauthorized desperation is, in his view of matters, the only way in which we can benefit ourselves, as well as the most glorious exhibition of true and genuine piety. And piety,—indeed, a transcendent display of it,—we have no doubt that this will be esteemed by some. Having no faith in divine testimony, and yet perfect faith in what his own views and feelings have dictated, he will be supposed to have given in this a beautiful and edifying example of the native tendencies of heavenly and spiritual principle. Tastes to be sure differ. To us, we confess, an act like that recommended by Mr. Newman conveys an impression of the most daring impiety and blasphemy. Rush with all our known sins cleaving to us, and loaded perhaps with still greater enormities, into the immediate presence and even arms of Deity! Why even heathen mythology rebukes such a practice, as fraught with the most fearful peril. Semele rushing into the arms of her celestial spouse, when revealed in all his glory, is instantaneously consumed. Sin, like the shirt of Nessus, cleaves to us, its poison entering deeply into our very vitals; and Mr. Newman's prescription to us is, that, in order to rid ourselves of our anguish, we should, copying the example of Hercules, commit an act of self-destruction—that we should throw ourselves headlong into him, whom Scripture declares to be *a consuming fire*. Heb. xii. 29. Our case, he may tell us, is desperate. True, in so far as we ourselves are concerned. But is it so, in reality? This is the very point at issue between him and us. Mediation, as embodied in the person and work of Christ Jesus, solves every difficulty; exhibiting God's character stainless, and man's salvation sure. In spite of Mr. Newman's assertions to the contrary, mediation runs throughout the whole of the Old Testament. The types and ceremonies of the law are inexplicable without having recourse to it. And it is involved in some of the most beautiful and interesting allegories. Queen Esther appearing in her robes of state, not in her ordinary habiliments, before her royal husband, and thus finding favour in his sight, suggests to us the doctrine. And the fact of the three children, when cast by the tyrant into the burning fiery furnace heated sevenfold, having escaped unscathed, in consequence of their having enjoyed the presence and protection of one like unto the Son of man, cannot fail to be regarded as another striking illustration of it. What is obscurely hinted at in the Old, constitutes the light and glory of the New Testament Scriptures. Mediation is not a doctrine depending on a single passage of Paul's writings; it is wrought into the very texture of the Gospels and Epistles. Understanding it, we do not venture to rush unadvisedly and impiously into God's presence as sinners; but nevertheless we find ourselves, sinners although we be, in his presence, and enabled to bear the full blaze of his heavenly glory. We here enter our solemn and decided protest against the doctrine of the sinner requiring to come to God through Christ, so common among the popular divines, as involving a view, if not so grossly outrageous, at all events as essentially unscriptural, as that of Mr. Newman. The sinner, in the matter of salvation, is called on to do nothing. It is God himself alone who, through Christ, renders the fact of mediation subservient to the sinner's everlasting benefit. It is God who, through Christ, draws near, by the manifestation of himself, to the sinner; and not the sinner who oversteps the gulf necessarily, except for God's work in Christ, interposed between himself and God. The sinner does not come to God, but the sinner is brought nigh to God, by Christ. This is accomplished by its being revealed to him, in the Scriptures, that sin, with human nature, hath been put away by Christ; and that righteousness, with the divine nature, hath been put upon him through the same glorious personage. The consequence is, that by an act of God, not by an act performed by himself, he is clothed with the robe of the Redeemer's righteousness, and attired in the garments of the divine salvation. One with the Son of God, he discovers, to his delighted surprise, that he is clothed upon with incorruption and immortality, and thereby denuded of the filthy vestments of sin and death, which had

descended to him, as an heir-loom, by means of his connection with Adam. Thus clothed, he is not found naked. Invested with the asbestos garment of righteousness and life everlasting in Christ Jesus, and thereby secure against the second death, he can encounter, without risk and without alarm, the wrath of God and of the Lamb. Rather, as a partaker of the divine nature in Christ Jesus, he knows that the wrath of God has been expended on the head of the adorable Surety, and has been by him completely and for ever put away.* Awful, however, would be his condition were he, with his flesh and blood nature, to attempt to force admission into God's heavenly kingdom; fearful his fate, if with guilt uncancelled, and merely at the suggestion of his own desperate conscience, he should venture to rush into the presence and throw himself into the arms of him who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, and who cannot look on sin, except with abhorrence. Behold here the difference between the two systems; that of Scripture, and that of Mr. Newman. According to the former, we are brought nigh to God through faith in his testimony concerning the death and resurrection of Christ. According to the latter, Mr. Newman rushes into God's immediate presence, disregarding and trampling under foot the work of Christ altogether; and trusts that God will not reject him, who, through faith in the dictates of his own mind, hath ventured on an act so great and so heroic, as that of giving him to whom he comes the lie, and pouring contempt upon his revealed and heavenly character. Reader! which of these two states of mind, thinkest thou, is the more consistent with truth and safety?

Vires acquirens eundo, in the fourth place, Mr. Newman advances through many struggles, and many failures, to a state of what he considers and denominates *spiritual perfection*. Recognizing in "human nature," itself, the existence of "spiritual" as well as "unspiritual elements," while to the former he ascribes that first act of *pious desperation* by which the soul, sinful and impure, ventures to fling itself into the arms of infinite purity and holiness, so to them also does he ascribe the "retaining of this close contact of the worshipper with the Supreme Purity," into which by its own powers it had been brought. See pp. 75, 76. Having, satisfactorily to himself, disposed of that "mediatorial doctrine," which in every case is attended with "uncompensated mischief," and "as applied to Jesus Christ is far more perplexed,"—that "mediatorial doctrine," by which "the spirituality of the early Gentile church" had been so seriously "endangered"—(p. 80) he proceeds, first of all, to correct the ideas of men, as to the affections or emotions—"the unmanageable side of their nature"—"that uneasy side of it on which alone activity resides," —finding fault with the uncontrolled invectives in which some indulge against it, and for "their denouncing it as utterly evil and incurable." He then, in the next place—with some sacrifice, in what he says of the affections afterwards, of that "logical coherence," with defect in which he charges the apostle Paul, —attempts to rescue *the will* from the charge of participation in evil; ascribing to the will alone the rank of being the man himself, and endeavouring to show that into whatever acts it might by the affections be betrayed, it was not to be held responsible for human imperfection. Upon the flesh alone, as operating through the affections, all evil is to be charged. Perhaps on a subject so momentous as this, it may be as well to allow Mr. Newman to speak for himself: "The same Paul, who so severely lashes his nature, and declares, 'I myself with the mind (Will) serve the law of God, *but with my flesh* (Affections) *the law of* SIN,' yet distinctly shows us that he did not regard himself as responsible for this imperfection. For he disowns this part of his nature as not himself: 'If then I do that which I would not, it is no more I that do it,

* Here classic mythology may be called in to our aid, if not to confirm, at least in illustration of the statements in the text. Achilles, owing to the precautions adopted by his goddess-mother, Thetis, could not sustain fatal injury, save in his heel. The believer rendered invulnerable, by being dipped, not in Stygian waters, but in the precious blood of him, the vulnerability of whose heel hath been the means of ending sin and crushing the serpent's head, hath had secured to him an immunity greater than that promised to the fabled son of Peleus—he *cannot be hurt of the second death*, Rev. ii. 11, that *having over him no power*.—Ibid. xx. 6.

but sin that dwelleth in me.' His comfort, his sufficient comfort, is not that Christ has atoned for it,—(that indeed might prove too much; for it would apply to sins of the Will, as well as to imperfection of the Affections,)*—but, that *nothing but his will is he himself.*" (The italics here are ours.) "If his Will commands his Heart not to covet, and yet the Heart will covet, Paul declares, 'My flesh has sinned, *but I have not.*'" (The italics again are ours.) "Of course then he had nothing to *repent* of: he felt grief, vexation, disappointment, *but not self-reproach:*" (italics ours:) "not one sting of it; and therefore no cloud passed between his soul and God."—p. 83. Such is a specimen of our author's fundamental principles. Evil, according to him, resides exclusively in the flesh, or affections, having no place in the will. And the stirrings of evil in his fleshly nature, he sets himself in opposition to, as constituting all that is evil in God's sight: this opposition of himself, or his will, (for it is the same thing,) to his fleshly nature, constituting the exercise of spiritual principle. Thus to resist, although not always able to overcome fleshly tendencies, indicates spiritual progress; and when, at last, the stirrings of the affections are no sooner felt, than they are resisted, and if possible, repressed, the state of perfection, or something approaching to it, has been attained to. "While it is needful to know the ways by which the soul, when fundamentally upright, can always regain her lost love; it would be discouraging indeed, if we might not look earnestly forward to attain even on this earth, a state in which the affections should be recovered as fast as lost—at intervals so short, that the heart should never reproach itself for sin, but only sigh over its inherent weakness. This seems to be the state which the Wesleyans (to the scandal of other Christians) have denominated Perfection, or Full Redemption, and after which they breathe in many beautiful and touching hymns."—p. 166. Stirrings of flesh, in the man advanced to a high degree of spirituality, are thus, it appears, not sin, or matters of self-reproach, but merely symptoms of still "inherent weakness." And the whole system may, in the following sentences, be summed up:—The will is the man himself.—p. 83. This will, so far from being sinful, serves the law of God.—*Ibid.* Sin resides not in the will, but in the emotions, as connected with the fleshly part of our nature; spirituality of mind consists in our making this discovery, and applying it to practice; we advance in spirituality, as we resist and strive to overcome the workings of fleshly emotions, by means of the innate power of will, loving the law of God, and labouring to yield obedience to it; and the height of spirituality consists, partly, in the constancy and readiness with which the tendencies of such sinful emotions are combated and put down, and partly in the full conviction of the mind, that such emotions spring not from ourselves, but from a body of flesh which in reality is foreign to us. To some, perhaps, this system may have particular charms; and in thus attempting to explain and develope it, we may, in the estimation of such, have been pronouncing its eulogium. Classically minded men—men familiar with the writings of Plato and Cicero—and those who are solicitous to separate between themselves and sin, without being obliged to submit to the hated doctrines propounded in Scripture, may be delighted with a system like that of Mr. Newman, which devolves every charge of sin upon flesh alone—which presents to them the will, or soul itself, as pure—and which exhibits it as capable, whenever it pleases, of disentangling itself from its degraded and temporary companion, and of asserting, by means of its own native energies, its heavenly rank and dignity. Scripture, and facts which always harmonize with Scripture, dispel every such illusion. The merest glance at the sacred writings suffices to show us that they deny the existence, and the possibility of the existence, of any spiritual elements in human nature. Even that natural and conditional immortality in man, which he forfeited by transgression, was not a spiritual principle. Although, by the Scriptures, sin is traced to a temptation addressed to a bodily appetite, its

* A curious and important admission on our author's part.

actual commission isa scribed to, and fastened down on, the will. It is man, not the bodily emotions of man, who sinned. Thus instead of recognizing the truth of Cicero's axiom, *mens cujusque, is est quisque*, which appears to be such a favourite with Mr. Newman, Scripture makes body, along with soul, to constitute the man; and represents sin, although perfected by the will, to have been nevertheless the act of the whole person. True, wherever the earnest of new-creation upon earth is enjoyed, God's word shows it to be restricted during the party's lifetime, to the mind: it is *the spirit* which *is life, because of righteousness*.—Rom. viii. 10. But, besides that this new creation, so far from being the mere development of "spiritual elements" previously existing in the soul, is actually the begun supersession of human mind by divine mind, through the conferring for the first time of spiritual principle,—so far is the privilege of new creation from being confined to the mind, as if that constituted the whole of man, that the previous new creation of mind, draws along with it as a necessary consequence the subsequent new creation of body likewise. *But if the spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you; he that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies, by his Spirit, that dwelleth in you.*—Ibid. 11. Mr. Newman's "spiritual elements" of human nature, it thus turns out, do not exist; and the natural or *soulical elements*, to which he would fain ascribe a *spiritual* and *heavenly* nature, are, when developed, seen to be characterised by features dark, sinful, and devilish, —leading him in whom they exist and prevail, not to God, but from God; inducing him to prefer *the lie* of self-religion, to faith *in the truth* of that religion which God hath seen meet to reveal; and causing him, instead of rejoicing in that liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free, to hug the chains of mental slavery, and sport himself with his own deceivings. This, however, is not all. Mr. Newman's will, as "a spiritual principle," serves the law, or acts in subserviency to prohibitions and commands; whereas, according to Scripture, especially according to the 6th chapter of Romans, in which the whole subject is clearly treated of and set forth, true spirituality consists in our being set free, through our oneness with Christ glorified, from law altogether: consists, in other words, in the revelation to us, through faith in the divine testimony, of Christ having become the end, fulfilment, or accomplishment of the law to us for righteousness; and of this righteousness of his, as divine, having not only swallowed up sin, which is human, in our consciences, but also, as seen by us to be ours through our oneness with him, become in us the spiritual principle of spiritual effects and consequences. Spirituality is not obedience to law, either in men or angels: in both, it operates, not as law does, by restraining from evil, 1 Tim. i. 9—11, but as it alone can, by constraining to good; and, in the people of God, as always and exclusively connected with the manifestation to them of law fulfilled and exhausted by Christ, and of God as loving them for Christ's sake, it takes the form of love, whereby as already one with Christ glorified and partakers of the earnest of his divine nature, they are *constrained to live, not unto themselves, but unto him that died for them, and that rose again.*—2 Cor. v. 15. Thus law, and love are, and ever must be, (except in the case of Christ in flesh,) antagonistic principles: the former, connected with human nature, and implying bondage; the latter, the principle of spirituality or the divine nature, and operating as the sole spirit of liberty.—See Rom. vi. *throughout*. Besides, instead of advancing spirituality implying such a progressive diminution of "the sense of sin" as tends to issue in *that sense* ultimately vanishing altogether, by our coming to regard the stirrings of fleshly emotion as not sinful at all, or at all events as matters with which we "need not reproach ourselves," they being only marks of "inherent weakness,"—Scripture, and such an experience as is coincident with Scripture, instruct us, that wherever spirituality, or the earnest of the mind of the glorified Jesus, is in a state of progressive operation, an increasing delicacy of conscience, a more vivid and constant perception of the motions of evil within us, a profounder acquaintance with the

latent phenomena of the human heart, a more painful conviction of our entire and unqualified opposition as Adam's descendants, to God's pure and holy nature, and a growing sense of humiliation on this account, are the invariable and necessary results. Hence, according to scriptural theology, Mr. Newman's perfection of religious attainments, as consisting in the ultimate extinction of "the sense of sin," seen by us to have nothing to do with ourselves, is the perfection of self-delusion. Unquestionably, *they that are Christ's, have crucified the flesh, with all its affections and lusts.*—Gal. v. 24. This crucifixion, however, is not an act of man's mind or will, as he naturally possesses it, but of the will as new-created or rendered divine, by the communication and indwelling of the mind of Christ; and the opposition of will thus made new, is directed against its own natural tendencies, no less than against those of the body, seeing that there are lusts of the mind, as well as lusts of the flesh.—Eph. ii. 2. There is fleshly mind, as well as fleshly body; and the mind made new in Christ Jesus, so far from recognizing in the former the existence of any "spiritual element," or cherishing any disposition to associate it with itself in the warfare against evil, is immediately manifested as its uncompromising opponent; its present crucifier, and its ultimate destroyer. Perfection in the creature, spirituality knows nothing of; perfection in Christ Jesus, involving deadly and destructive opposition to all creature pretensions, is what alone it rejoices in. At this point, indeed, comes out the thorough antagonism of Mr. Newman's theory to the truth of God, as made known in the Scriptures. The will of man is, in Mr. Newman's opinion, a spiritual principle; and it is in consequence of the will putting forth its native and spiritual energies, in opposition to the tendencies and emotions of body, to which alone he thinks the epithets *flesh*, and *fleshly*, can be applied, that sin, as resident in body alone, can be overcome, and perfection realized. The doctrine of Scripture, on the contrary, is that the will of man is the principle by which sin was originally committed, as well as the part of human nature in which sin has ever since had its residence and stronghold; that so far from being spiritual, the will is merely fleshly, like the body with which it is connected; and that so far from being able to act as the associate of God in opposition to evil, it is itself *not subject to the law of God, nor indeed able to be so.*—Rom. viii. 7. Opposition to evil, by that which is itself the principle of evil—Satan cast out by Satan himself—is thus it appears the very core and substance of Mr. Newman's theory; and presents to us an idea not more characterized by absurdity, than impossible to be reconciled with the Scriptures of truth. The will of man, which is the fountain of evil, as being essentially opposed to God's law, cannot bring forth good; so says the sacred record: the will of man, surrounded and encrusted though it be with evil, being sound at bottom, may work itself free from the unhallowed association, stand forth in all its native purity and excellence, and become the source of all good; so says our author. It is granted that the Scriptures, so far from denying, make us acquainted with the existence of a religion of human will, by means of which much that is excellent and profitable to men, is capable of being produced; nay, that they have gone so far as to furnish us with an example of this kind of religion, advanced to the highest pitch of perfection, in the case of Saul of Tarsus, afterwards Paul the apostle: but they take care, at the same time, to instruct us, that proficiency in it is proficiency in wickedness,—*the things that are highly esteemed among men, being an abomination in the sight of God.*—Luke xvi. 15. The origin of every such religion being self, or the sinful will of the creature; its object in overcoming bodily propensities, and presenting an exterior of moral purity, being not to glorify God, but to magnify the power, and promote the interests of self; and the righteousness which it attempts to set up having for its aim to render the revealed righteousness of God unnecessary, by enabling us to dispense with it, there is exhibited to us in every such religion, a view of sin, not in the low form of wallowing in sensual pollutions, but in the highest possible form of intense, concentrated, and blasphemous opposition of self to

God. Thus did that form of it, in which he had himself been so great a proficient, appear to the apostle Paul, when, through divine teaching, he was brought to the possession of *a sound mind*. That apostle who, before the divine righteousness was revealed to him, had been *as to the righteouness of the law blameless;* and who, rejoicing in the perfection of his own character, had been opposing with all his might, and with great human sincerity, the righteousness made known in the gospel; the moment the righteousness and life of God in Christ Jesus were revealed to him as his, saw himself, in his previous opposition of human perfection to divine perfection, to have been *the chief of sinners.*—1 Tim. i. 15. That is, the very fact of the "sense of sin" in him having, previous to his conversion, entirely vanished, and of his having stood blameless in his own sight,—a state of mind, which, springing from a consciousness of having put forth the energies of self, constitutes Mr. Newman's *ideal* of *spiritual perfection*, (see p. 166,) was discovered by him, in the light of the divine righteousness, to have constituted in him *the perfection of wickedness:* so that from the height of his former fancied superiority, he sunk at once into the condition of one who felt himself, when most *righteous according to the flesh*, to have been *a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious.* Ibid. 13. Has the case of Paul no lesson to teach to Mr. Newman and to others who, like him, having deified self, conceive the highest possible aim of man to be through it the attainment of human perfection?

(Unavoidably divided from unexpected length, and to be concluded in our next.)

DR. THOM AND HIS WORKS.—"THE NUMBER AND NAMES OF THE APOCALYPTIC BEASTS. Part I. THE NUMBER AND NAMES." *London: H. K. Lewis, Gower Street.* 1850.

IN introducing the readers of this Magazine to Dr. David Thom, of Liverpool, and his theological writings, it may be necessary for the present reviewer, who can neither adopt the editorial "we," nor subscribe even to all the doctrines of the *Universalist*, to observe that he is himself but an individual reader uttering an individual judgment, as all other reviewers doubtless are, if the truth were known, but individual men—reading, it is to be hoped, for themselves, and uttering their own judgments.—As for the learned and reverend author whose work or works are now in question, it may be of importance also to state, with respect to him, that whether rightly appreciated by his friends or not, by his enemies at least and by most strangers he has hitherto been sadly misr. presented and misunderstood. Few men perhaps in the Christian world at this moment have a more peculiar destiny, or stand in their lot, whatever it may be, with blither equanimity. After a period of twenty-five years' reclusion, or more, from all religious society whatever, spent in unremitting and almost thankless labour, to commend a system of divine truth elaborated by himself to the notice of the world, he holds on his way, in 1849—50, with unabated vigour and increasing joy. It is to but a few comparatively yet, that his ideas of Christianity are known at all, and to the hundreds who devoutly abjure them they are possibly simply an enigma. There seems to be a vague impression on the religious mind about him, thus far: he has been excommunicated, he is rather fanatical, he stands alone; he has written certain books of a dangerous tendency, he is mistaken for a Socinian, he is possibly an atheist; one cannot tell what he is; he is altogether a heretic! This last conjecture, happily, is the utmost and the very worst that can be truly entertained concerning him:—he is a thorough-going, high-minded, philosophical, original heretic; yet neither a Socinian nor an atheist, (and let his countrymen in particular know this,) but a Calvinist of the highest order. The truth of this report may be

easily ascertained by any one who chooses to examine his works. That Essay of his, for example, (and which is the foundation of his whole system,) called "Divine Inversion;" in which doubtless there are some things "hard to be understood," to be acquiesced in at least,—but in which also are some most comprehensive, sublime, and truly philosophical ideas. As for the rest, Dr. Thom is a Scotchman, of the clerico-Bradwardine stamp; of most extensive erudition, of high literary attainments, full of classical quotations; incredibly earnest, (*perfervido ingenio*)—and with no small share even of the dry, "sub-acid" humour of his countrymen; but most humane withal, most generous and considerate; of gentlemanly bearing, and the utmost liberality of feeling.

In reading his "Divine Inversion" one insensibly begins to tremble for the fate of ancient prejudices: ultimately their doom seems to be inevitable. There is a crochet or two notwithstanding, obtruded there, with which the author himself also may have to part in the long run. It is not, however, with this in the meantime, but with his more recent work on Apocalyptic prophecy we have to do:—to the "Inversion" we may return again, as being the most original and philosophic of all his performances, but shall content ourselves for the present with an outline of his *Number and Names of the Beasts*.

The volume now before us, No. 1, which is but the first part of Dr. Thom's projected treatise on the subject, consists substantially of three distinct portions. The first of these, the author calls an introduction; but it contains in fact what will probably be most interesting to the general reader, a brief but well digested and satisfactory account of the history and scope of the Apocalypse; with a clear, candid, and manly avowal of Dr. Thom's own views of that portion of the divine record, and of the principles on which it should be interpreted. Right or wrong, we have met with nothing yet, either in print or in preaching, which corresponds more with our own ideas of the Revelation than those now presented to us in this volume, and we can desire nothing more than their consistent and impartial development hereafter. Of this mystical book Dr. Thom observes, that although only a glimpse of its true significance can for the present be enjoyed, yet, "if any man shall understand this Book to be the opening up of the mind and kingdom of the glorified Jesus, as contrasted with the minds and views of earthly men, and with the nature and constitution of earthly kingdoms; to be the manifestation of the Church of Christ, as contrasted with bodies of men and earthly associations, which have arrogantly and presumtuously usurped the name; to be the explanation of the New Testament economy as shadowed forth by the Old; and to be a view of the progress of matters during New Testament times, from the period of the apostolic ministry, till the second advent of our Lord, at the close of this present world, in the fulness of his mediatorial glory; the person entertaining such views cannot be far mistaken."—p. 16. Probably not. This is, indeed, going rather farther than we can ourselves boast of having been carried hitherto by our own views on the subject; but it seems to be farther only, and perhaps not too far, in the right direction.

In the second portion of this work, (which may be called the Student's own) the author has devoted much pains, and an almost incredible amount of learning and research, to the exposure of the numerous false or inadequate conjectures which have hitherto been submitted to the religious world on the subject of which he treats. Our only complaint here is, that he has condescended to investigate certain of them at all; for the puerility, and manifest absurdity of very many of them would have justified *their* omission altogether. But it seems to be Dr. Thom's principle, to let every one have the credit of his own invention, having reserved for himself the labour, and, if we may auger anything from his present performance, being likely to enjoy the honour of superseding them all. There is one thing, indeed, we cannot help observing at this point, which is, that in general all attempts at the solution of this divine enigma have too much the appearance of trivial childish guesses. Is the significance of the 666 in Revelation rightly understood yet? Or is it still the grand check-lock and

"*Open Sesame*" of prophetic interpretation? Dr. Thom, we are aware, disavows all further dependence on the terms of this enigma, than as a literal compliance with them affords a test of the correctness, so far, of his *practical* solution. It is to the practical solution then, O Doctor, we desire to look. For this, however, it appears we must have patience as yet; but in the meantime are not left altogether without an earnest of it. In the third and last portion of the work, (which most of his readers are likely to peruse *first*,) that solution, in the *Number and Names* of the Beast, is announced; but the author for the present simply indicates the discovery he has made, reserving the illustration and application of it for another volume. The *first Beast* he designates THE MIND, or fleshly intelligence of man; and the *second*, on a similar principle of interpretation, he affirms to be all *Fleshly Churches:* both of which names, by orthographical enumeration in the original Greek, produce the enigmatical number of Revelation, viz. 666. Dr. Thom proposes this interpretation not as a mere conjecture of words, but as the discovery of absolute truth. He must be confident, therefore, in the propriety and force of its application in a practical way; and apparently not without reason. Whether his peculiar views in theology may be permitted to interfere materially with his further prosecution of this interesting and important theme, it would be improper now to surmise. That they *will* interfere, less or more, we are so far perhaps constrained to expect; but we should individually regret nothing more, (and many of his admirers we are persuaded, will sympathize with us,) than that any speculative bias, however amiable or original, should warp the execution of a design that seems to comport, in the very naming of it, so happily and so pre-eminently with the spirit and the whole tenor of the divine record.

A MODERN NONCONFORMIST.

THOUGHTS FOR THE THOUGHTFUL.—No. I.

I NEED not do more than remind my reflective, upright readers, that there is a decided difference, in sentiment, between a true New Testament Universalist and every sect of Partialists. I do not apply the term *sect* to the advocates of the "world's propitiation," for the very term would involve a *contradiction*. A Sectarian *must* be a "Partialist;" a Universalist *cannot* be. I do not use the word "Partialist" offensively; but simply to express every Sectarian, as *rejecting* the *absolute certain redemption of all men*, (without any *hypothesis* whatever) through the one infinitely glorious atonement of our blessed Lord Jesus Christ.

It is right to observe that sterling integrity of deed and word is quite *compatible* with the kindest feeling of Christian love. "Faithful are the wounds of a friend."—Prov. xxvii. 6. I therefore shall write very decidedly, under this impression, the following thoughts.

I. Partialists, when opposing Universalists, are very much in the habit of sternly demanding the most explicit and straightforward answer as to any passages they produce in *opposition* to the salvation of all men. This is quite right, and we do not at all object to it. But we say, in return, that a real lover of truth, for the truth's sake, ought to remember that he is *bound* by his *own* conduct to act thus himself. No Christian ought to ask questions and expect answers, free from all mental equivocation or reservation whatever, from others, who will not so act towards others *himself*.

We are quite willing to take every statement of Scripture in the very words God has been pleased to use. We shrink from no Scriptural scrutiny which the Partialist of any sect produces. We ask no quarter here, but we demand

that every Scripture shall receive EQUAL *reverence;* for the Holy Spirit is the mover in all that the holy men of God have written. 2 Pet. ii. 21.

II. It may be inquired, Is it true that questions are *evaded* by the opposers of the love of God to all men? I reply, quite true, as far as my personal observation has gone for some years. I have found the Partialist putting Scripture *against* Scripture to *contradict* the texts he objects to receive, as worded, that oppose him; instead of *comparing* Scripture with Scripture and expecting to find perfect unqualified truth and harmony in every word of God.

An example or two here. I have asked such questions as these:

Jesus Christ says, "I lay down my life for the *sheep.*" John v. 15. Is this TRUE?

Jesus Christ says, "I will give my flesh for the life of the world." John vi. 51. Is this TRUE?

When I ask the Partialist, Are both these expressions from the lips of our blessed Lord, recorded in the same gospel of John, EQUALLY true? I find a positive assertion readily given to the *first*, but a sad attempt to mystify and make conditional the *second.* Whilst the words, in both texts, are completely and unconditionally in the *absolute* form; for it is admitted that the sheep, church, elect, &c., are *not* the world, and that the world *cannot* be the sheep. But then comes the attempt to *neutralize* these two texts by various unhallowed quirks. When told that the word "*world*" (κοσμος) is the *only*, and the *strongest* word used for the redemption of the world, and that the Lord and his apostles always used *that* and no other, I have heard it stated, both in and out of the pulpit, that "Christ gave himself for the church *only*," as if this word "*only*" was really in the text. But when the objector has been reminded that it is not there, and if it were, that the other text of Christ giving "His flesh for the life of the world" must be positively false,—another subterfuge is at hand, and I am then told, *that* means, the "*elect* world." Now this is a perfect *anomaly*, to talk about an "elect κοσμος," an expression never used, and as unmeaning as to say an "*elect whole*,"—an "elect world dying in Adam," and meaning only some dying in him. The *impossibility* of taking both Scriptures (and I might *pair* many more, in which the church and the world are perfectly distinct in connexion with Christ's death, yet both *interested*)—I say, the impossibility of taking both *believingly* on the Partialist's system is so apparent, that he not unfrequently shows a very unlovely aspect towards his differing brother, who cannot consent to have the Lord's own words, in any passage, *mutilated.*

III. So also when told that "the living God is the Saviour of all men, especially of them that believe," (the faithful, *Greek,*) then it is said, O yes, God saves all by his providence in giving food, &c., as if Paul would "labour and suffer reproach" for that. 1 Tim. iv. 10. Whereas facts declare, as with a voice of thunder, that myriads have perished, by storms, earthquakes, fire, famine, and in a thousand other ways, not greater sinners than others, and multitudes of infants too in every age. Besides, this would have nothing to do with redemption by Christ, but refer to this life *only.* This is just making one sentence in this verse a *conditional uncertainty*, and another sentence a Divine truth; whereas both are absolute affirmations. There is no God-fearing reverence manifest for His word in such a line of conduct.

Again, when the positive language is quoted, "God our Saviour will have (θελει, wills) all men *to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth,*" 1 Tim. ii. 4—6, we are beaten off the blessed words by a painful torturing of the language. *Again* and *again* it has been stated, "Yes, God *wishes* all men to be saved, but they will not come," &c. Thus the *sin* of the creature is daringly put in *antagonism* with the WILL of the Omnipotent Creator, and a word of *wishing*, an *impotent* creature's desire, which has no *power* in it, is to nullify the absolute declaration of God's will. This profane handling the word of God—this blot on the precious boundless efficacy of the blood of Christ, by making him to die in vain, is very distressing to many a truly humble, grace-taught mind.

IV. Further, I have to notice the very common practice of studiously avoiding, in public preaching and teaching, the many texts which clearly express and imply, that our Lord's sacrifice for all men is not only *sufficient*, but *efficient* for the election—the *first fruits*,—and the collection—*all*. Or if such Scriptures are noticed, it is in a cursory, general way; not with an ardent, prayerful searching into "all the counsel of God," in its unbroken connexion, to see whether "Behold the Lamb of God, which beareth away the *sin* of the world," be not the uniform unvaried gospel which the apostles preached, instead of a limited atonement, merely embracing a fraction of mankind, but leaving the bulk worse off than if Christ had not died, by making out that they have, in a large proportion, rejected him of whom it is admitted they could have never heard; or, on a smaller scale, although they may have heard, have no advantage in the death of him concerning whom it is written, "He tasted death for every man," and "gave himself a ransom for all," and this too, "to be testified in due time."—See the Greek of I Tim. ii. 6.

V. I must not omit, in this first paper, to comment on one of the most specious "devices of Satan," in popular use, to suppress inquiry and intimidate simple Christians from even looking at this blessed truth of the world's salvation: to wit, that it is "very pleasing to the ungodly because it encourages them in their sins," and so forth. Now, although this snare has been laid open over and over again, the exposure is passed by and the objection still maintained. But plain, palpable facts are the best refutation of any and every sophistry;—and it is a *fact* that the openly ungodly care nothing about truth or falsehood as to Divine revelation; they trouble not themselves about God, his word, or their sins; they are not attendants on the worship of God, nor the characters that inquire in any way after Scripture truth. It is the sectarian professors of all names who oppose the certain atonement of Christ for all men, and of these some are immensely large bodies;—but, I ask, does the opposite doctrine, that some of their fellow-creatures will be immortalized for endless misery, make them holier than the Christians they so oppose? By no means! What sin do they shun on that account? Alas! many, very many heart-rending crimes have been committed by rigidly bitter *avowed* believers in "endless torment," of all sects; preachers and hearers: and, when the doctrine has been proclaimed, neither the sectarian teachers nor their communities ever apply it as for themselves, but always refer it to others, whom they are pleased to call the "*reprobate*." Moreover, some most exemplary disciples of Jesus have been actually expelled, after many years standing among them, for venturing to touch on this subject in their religious meetings—men and women whose Godly walk has adorned their holy profession. No, no, there is no fear of Universalists becoming a very large body. Thanks be to God, they are increasing, and many more would appear, who secretly believe and love the doctrine as a Divinely revealed truth, but for the "fear of man," which sadly ensnares them. From our Lord's day till now, those who teach that, "God is love," essential love itself, to all men, have always been in the *minority*; for this precious doctrine powerfully enforces the living Godly in Christ Jesus, and the practice of love and good-will to all men. It is a Christ-like grace, and sectarianism of any kind cannot endure this equality of redeeming mercy for all.

Let a Christian be known to hold this view, however excellent his Christian character, and useful his talents, it is generally enough to keep him from admission among any partialist community; or, if he happen to be in, and the Lord is pleased to open his heart and understanding to love and avow this truth, it will be ground sufficient, with them, "*to cast him out*." Facts are stubborn things; and many readers of the "Universalist" know this to be a lamentable fact.

VI. Christians are to speak God's words, and leave it with God to prove the truth of all His own statements. Let them tell out the distinctive truth, that God does not remit the punishment due to *acts* of transgression; for, in

this matter, the Scriptures imperatively affirm, "*He is no respecter of persons;* but will render to every one, both Jew and Gentile, according to his deeds. Whilst, through Jesus Christ, and in Him, we have, as sinners, "the forgiveness of sins; for "the wages of *the* sin is death," but "the GIFT of God is *life;* and as *in* Adam all have died, so *in* Christ shall all be made alive." The first Adam, a living *soul*, life to all; the second Adam, a life-making *spirit*, to all,—the perfect *antithesis* of the first Adam in every respect.

These remarks are penned with affectionate fidelity, solely under the impression, that I must not compromise any one revealed truth; for, although by so doing I might please men, I should displease our Heavenly Father, and grieve His holy Spirit.

Before I close this paper, I wish to fix upon every honest Partialist's mind, this query.—Supposing, for the sake of argument, God had *intended* to tell us that He really did mean we should believe, with child-like docility, that by the terms,—world—all men—every man—the whole world, and many other Scriptures, *equally plain*, He meant *exactly* what the words absolutely express in their simple, legitimate import. With reverence let the question be agitated. Could God, himself, have spoken more *plainly* and *absolutely*? If so—will some Partialist give us a *sample* of what *English* words could possibly be used stronger than those God has used for such a purpose?

SUUM CUIQUE.

POETRY.

What though at birth we bring with us the seed
Of sin, a mortal taint,—in heart and will
Too surely felt, too plainly shown in deed,—
Our fatal heritage; yet are we still
The children of the All Merciful; and ill
They teach, who tell us that from hence must flow
God's wrath, and then his justice to fulfil,
Death everlasting, never-ending woe:
O miserable lot of man if it were so!

Falsely and impiously teach they who thus
Our heavenly Father's holy will misread!
In bounty hath the Lord created us,
In love redeem'd. From this authentic creed
Let no bewildering sophistry impede
The heart's entire assent, for God is good.
Hold firm this faith, and, in whatever need,
Doubt not but thou wilt find thy soul endued
With all-sufficing strength of heavenly fortitude!

Southey's Poetical Works, p. 496.

EXTRACT FROM AN UNPUBLISHED WORK,—"MAN AND HIS MAKER." BY EDWARD COCK, OF STONEHOUSE, DEVON.

"The Scriptures proclaim God to be essentially "light;" (i John, i. 5,) and essentially "love." (i John iv. 8.) Like the sun, (which is often used as an emblem of Deity,) God is essentially luminous and warm,—life-giving and life-blessing,—pure and kindly,—"light" and "love!" These two simple views of His Character comprehend all His Glory,—all His Attributes! It is thus he becomes a sun and shield,—to give grace and glory "to all the creatures of His Power." The "light" for ever shines, unchangeably perfect, whatever

clouds or mutations in mortal things may hide, for a time, its rays! and those rays are ever warm with "love," although His infinite wisdom allows shadowy variations to those on whom it acts! All Creation, and all Revelation eminated from His essential light and heat! Christ was born of this holy combination, as one amalgamated, mighty, essential Power. Redemption, with all its wonders, owes its existence to nothing more—to nothing less!—Heaven, with all its glories, has no other song, no other bliss! Eternity, with all its ages, will have for mental emulous unravelment, no other theme than the ever blessed, the eternal fountain of "light" and "love!" How evidently then, was the Mediatorial Jesus, "the brightness of the Father's Glory,—"the God manifested in the flesh," (i Tim. iii. 16.) when, in the work He performed, that "God" was so "manifest" as that—

"Here the *whole* Diety is known;
Nor dares the creature guess
Which of the glories brightest shone,
The *Justice* or the *Grace!*"—*Watts.*

Extract from Doctor Philip Nicholas Shuttleworth's Paraphrastic Translation of the Apostolical Epistles.

"It is expressly asserted, in various parts of the Apostolical Epistles, that the redemption of mankind, by the expiatory atonement of Christ, was decreed by the divine foreknowledge before the creation of the world. Hopeless as must be every human attempt to inquire into the unsearchable mysteries of God's providence, still we may surely venture to surmise, from this revealed fact, that the prospective arrangement then made, by the infinite mercy of our Creator, for averting the miseries consequent upon the introduction of sin, was adequate in its operation to the gracious object contemplated by Him: in other words, *that widely spread as is the transmitted evil, the consequence of the fall of our first parents, the remedial effects of our blessed Saviour's atonement will one day be fully co-extensive with it.*'—Fourth Edit. p. 212.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

Sir,—Since I sent you my paper No. 1, "Thoughts for the Thoughtful," I have seen a monthly journal, called "*The Christian Witness and Church Member's Magazine,*" *the official organ of the Congregational Union of England and Wales;*—and on page 63 of the February number, there is a piece, which I now extract, *verbatim et literatim, with the italics exactly marked.*

"UNIVERSALISM."

"A Universalist preacher, passing through a neighbourhood where this *modern* faith had not gained a foothold, took occasion to set forth his views in a sermon. At the close of his discourse, he remarked, that if the people desired to hear him again, he would preach on his return. After there had been a silence of a few moments, a sensible old Quaker rose and said, 'If thou hast told the *truth*, we do not *need* to hear thee; if thou hast told us a *lie*, we do not *want* to hear thee.'"

"Another preacher of the same creed held forth in another neighbourhood. An old German blacksmith happened to be present, and was very uneasy by the discourse. When the congregation were dismissed, he approached the preacher, and said, 'If this doctrine is true, be sure you must not preach it here any more.' 'Why not?' inquired the preacher. 'Because,' said he, 'one of my neighbours has already stolen one half my smith's tools; and if he does hear this doctrine, be sure he will have all the rest.'"

"The Quaker and the blacksmith were both sensible men."

The above paragraph stands under the head of "Things to think on." The editor of this said "Christian Witness" *has long and loudly sounded his own trumpet,* in his remarks to correspondents, as to *his impartiality and love of truth;* although some of the sects have expressed their doubt a *little* on this point. But with this matter, between him and them, I meddle not. Suffice it for me to say as I

have *no* faith that any counter statements would be admitted into that sectarian journal, I do not send them *there*. Moreover, I wish the readers of "The Universalist," who may not see this *morceau*, to be put in possession of *one* out of the many samples of opposition to the blessed doctrine of God's salvation for all men, under cover of *anonymous trashy witticism*.

I constantly "think on" what I read; and now present a thought or two, which sprung up in my mind on reading the above. You know, dear Sir, that it is not an uncommon case among the Newspaper Journals, when driven up for matter by the time of publication, to get some ready scribbler in their establishments to *manufacture* some *wonderful scrap* to fill up a vacancy in their papers. It strikes me this said practice is sometimes adopted in what are called "religious periodicals."

Reviewing the extract, I thought—How is it that there is no *mention* whatever of THE WHERE!—THE WHEN!—THE PREACHERS!—THE TEXTS!—nor a SINGLE SENTENCE given of the sermons. Whether years gone by, or *very recently*, if ever preached at all.

We are told that a "sensible old Quaker" rose and said to the first preacher, "If thou hast told us the *truth* we do not *need* to hear thee." It appears that this sensible Quaker did not know whether he had heard *truth* or not. But I certainly thought that *truth* in religion was so *important*, that it was quite desirable to hear it more than *once*. The apostles were very anxious to stir up the minds of Christians "*by way of remembrance*." It appears to be a very strange way of this "Quaker" showing *his* sense.

As to the German blacksmith's speech, having no extract from the sermon, it is also not possible to decide. The Quaker and the blacksmith may "both be *sensible men*;" but it would have read much better, as the doctrine appeared so strange to them, if *we could have read* that they had told the preachers, "We will go home and patiently 'search the Scriptures,' in the fear of God, whether those things stated are so:"—a practice professors are sadly remiss in doing. This would have shown that they were men of *piety* as well as *sense*.

My last thought about this document is, that it is another of the disreputable efforts to cast into the shade a very precious truth, which Jesus Christ and his apostles taught in the fullest and plainest terms; and also to pour contempt upon those Christians who live upon and rejoice in the doctrine, that "Christ is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world."—1 John ii. 2.

Christian Universalists have nothing to fear from such conduct as this. We can afford to "come to the light." Persons who shrink from argument are often found very fond of ambush fighting; but God's word is true when it says, "Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee: the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain."—Psalm lxxvi. 10.

"Veritas Dei est magna et prævalebit."

SUUM CUIQUE.

To D. W.

SIR,—I have read, with much interest, the Tract on Oaths, referred to in the Postscript of your Letter to the Editor of the Universalist, p. 47, 48; and am glad to find that the subject will be again brought before Parliament. The Tract, indeed, so exhausts the subject, that it leaves, with one exception, nothing more to be said. I allude to a circumstance, generally unknown or overlooked, which, if suitably urged, ought to have much weight with a body which considers Christianity "as part and parcel of the law of the land;" and especially with the bench of Bishops. It is this: that the form "So help me God," is actually borrowed from *Heathenism*. "*Ita me Deus Fidius juvet*—So may the Son of Jupiter help me. *Deus Fidius:* a surname of Hercules, the god of Faith."—Salmon's Stammata Latinitatis. Vol. I. p. 297. The inconsistency of a body professedly Christian, thus discarding Christian motives for Heathenish imprecation, appears to me so glaring, that, if represented in its true colours by an able speaker, it might be expected to put further opposition to shame. The ceremony of *kissing* the book is also Heathenish and superstitious. "Among the ancient idolators, to kiss the idol was an act of the most solemn worship."....

"And, in allusion to this rite, the holy Psalmist, calling upon the apostate faction to avert the wrath of the incarnate God, by a full acknowledgement of his Divinity, bids them 'kiss the Son:' i. e. worship him."—Horsley's Hosea. xiii. 2. Hence, though we cannot too highly value the Revelation conveyed to us through the medium of language, this gives no authority to honour *print and paper* by a religious act expressing worship; and when, to make a stronger impression on the minds of Romanists, a *cross* (as I have often seen) is figured on the cover of the book, the ceremony becomes still more objectionable.

Hoping to promote, by these suggestions, the object of your laudable exertions,

I am, Sir, truly yours,

D. E.

THE UNIVERSALIST.

APRIL, 1850.

EXAMINATION OF BISHOP BLOOMFIELD'S NOTE ON MARK, IX. 43—48.

Bishop Bloomfield has a Note on this passage, from which, by his reference to Origen, and to Professor Stuart's Essays, he appears to be unacquainted with the present state of the controversy. He does not seem to know, that the limited torment of Origen is rejected by hundreds of thousands as a remnant of the old leaven of endless torment; and that the Professor's Essays have received an answer, by Mr. Balfour, of Charlestown, Massachusets, to which, as having passed through three editions, it was incumbent on him, if able, to reply. Mr. Balfour, after mentioning three previous opponents, writes thus, in the Introduction to the third edition, published in 1832.

"The last attempt to refute the Inquiry,* was made by Professor Stuart, of Andover. From some cause or other, the public had long looked to him, to furnish a refutation to the Inquiry. The failure of the preceding attempts to refute it was imputed by some to want of talent. When Mr. Sabine did not succeed, we heard it remarked—'If Mr. Stuart only takes hold of it, he will easily refute it.' At last, his Exegetical Essays appeared in 1830. Though he avoids naming me or the Inquiry in them, it is obvious enough to all, they were written to counteract the effect which the Inquiry had produced on the public mind; and also what I had written, in my Second Inquiry, on the words rendered everlasting, and for ever, in the common version. We replied to these Essays, in a series of letters addressed to Mr. Stuart, which were published in 1831. He has not yet made any reply to them. Here the controversy for the present rests.

"Before Mr. Stuart's Essays appeared, we supposed he must have something new and powerful to produce: that the Inquiry would receive a full and fair reply, and that I should see in what my error consisted. But we are entirely disappointed; for, like all the preceding attempts to refute it, the principal facts and arguments are passed over without

* An Inquiry into the Scriptural import of the words Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, and Gehenna, all translated Hell in the Common English Version.

any notice. Indeed many of Mr. Stuart's statements confirm the views advanced in the Inquiry. We begin to suspect no respectable reply can be made to it, which will prove that Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, or Gehenna, designates a place of endless misery to the wicked. We have too high an opinion of Mr. Stuart's understanding to think that he considers his Essays deserving the name of an answer to the Inquiry. We never heard of a single intelligent man, orthodox or otherwise, who thinks his Essays a reply to it; but we have heard several express a contrary opinion. If the book then is not answerable, we may say, it yet remains unanswered."

A passage of the Professor's Essays, which the Bishop cites with especial commendation, runs as follows—"*If the Scriptures have not asserted the* ENDLESS punishment of the wicked, neither have they *asserted the* ENDLESS *happiness of the righteous, nor the* ENDLESS *glory and existence of the Godhead.* The one is equally certain with the other. Both are laid in the same balance. They must be tried by the same tests. And if we give up the one, we must, in order to be consistent, give up the other also." But, notwithstanding this imposing display of italics and capitals, it is an obvious fact, as may be seen in any Concordance, that the Bible does not furnish one example of the adjective ENDLESS coupled with punishment. The same remark applies to other negatives occurring in Scripture: viz. ουκ εσται τελος, (Luke i. 33,) ακαταλυτος, (Heb. vii. 16,) απερανταος, (1 Tim. i. 4,) αφθαρτος, (1 Pet. i. 4.) It is therefore an impossibility to lay these opposites in the *same* balance, or to try them by the *same* tests; and the arguments, by which the Professor attempts it, are necessarily inconsistent and deficient. For example.

"I take it," says he, "to be a rule in construing all *antithetic* forms of expression, that where you can perceive the force of one side of the antithesis, you do of course come to a knowledge of the force of the other side. If *life eternal* is promised on one side, and *death eternal* is threatened on the other and opposite one, is it not to be supposed that the word *eternal*, which qualifies *death*, is a word of equal force and import with the word *eternal* which qualifies life? In no other case could a doubt be raised, with regard to such a principle." . . . . To this Mr. Balfour replies:

"1st. You here, as all along, assume that '*eternal life*,' refers to the future endless happiness of the righteous. Yea, you assume, that αιων and αιωνιος are, in fact sixty times so applied in the New Testament. This I deny; and here, I think, one capital mistake lies on the subject in discussion. 'Eternal life' designates indeed the happiness of the righteous; but it is their happiness in this world. This I have shown in my Second Inquiry, and saves me the labour of showing it here. The one side of your antithesis, I consider then, a false assumption, and of course it affects all you have said. But even if it was admitted true, let us notice—

"2nd. The other side of the contrast. You say '*life eternal* is on the one side, contrasted with *death eternal* on the other.' But this is, if possible, a still greater mistake, for no such contrast is found in the Bible. The phrase 'eternal death' is used by no sacred writer." . . . "The very want of such an antithesis shows you are mistaken, some-

how or another, in your views on this subject." . . . "I am aware that you may object, and say—It is true, the precise phrase '*eternal death*' is not used in Scripture, but is not *eternal punishment* used and contrasted with *eternal life*, Matt. xxv. 46, etc.? I most freely grant this, but in reply would say, 1st. This change in the phrase, on the one side of the contrast, does not alter the case, until it is proved, that eternal life on the other, refers to the endless happiness of the righteous in a *future world.*" . . . "Substitute then what phrase you please, on the other side of the contrast, in the place of *eternal death*, your doctrine of eternal punishment can never be established, until you prove that *eternal life*, on the other side, refers to the endless happiness of the righteous in heaven."—Reply to Professor Stuart's Exegetical Essays, p. 73—75.

"But let us examine," says Mr. Balfour, "if this antithetic rule, on which you place so much dependence, is not the ruin of your doctrine of endless punishment." . . . "Paul says, Rom. v. 18, 19—'Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men (εις παντας ανθρωπους) to condemnation; even so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men (εις παντας ανθρωπους) unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience, many (οι πολλοι) were made sinners; so by the obedience of one, shall many (οι πολλοι) be made righteous.' Again he says, 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22, 'For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all (παντες) die, even so in Christ shall all (παντες) be made alive.' Such is a specimen of the antithetic mode of speaking on this subject."

That cause must be weak, or weakly advocated, which is supported by such criticisms as the following.

"I have no doubt," says the Professor, "that the word *sheol* in this case," Job xxi. 13, "does involve the idea of *sudden death*, or *dying*, as a calamity. The question however is, whether in the mind of the speaker, in such a case, any thing more was probably contemplated, than the simple fact of sudden *natural death?* The answer to this must of course depend on the fact, whether the speaker believed in any future retribution, any future punishing of the vicious, and rewarding of the virtuous. In case he did, (and who will undertake to show that he did not?) then how can we avoid the apprehension, that he connected with going suddenly and violently down to *sheol*, the idea of a miserable condition there? How can we *rationally* avoid such an apprehension?" "Is it not strange," Mr. Balfour replies, "that you should talk and reason in this manner? for, 1st. How can any one tell what was '*in the mind of the speaker*, whether the speaker believed in any future punishment,' but by what he has expressed? And if he has expressed it any where, why do you not produce it? But what he has expressed, you make to depend on something believed in his mind on the subject, which he has not expressed. And unless we can show that he had not your doctrine of future punishment in his mind, which he has not expressed, you conclude it must have been in his mind, though he has not expressed it." . . . "2nd. Does not such a mode of proving your cause show its weakness; and that 'philological disquisition' is here out of the question? If you can prove '*the fact*,' on which the truth of your doctrine is allowed to depend, is it correct for

you to assume it, and call on those whom you oppose to disprove it? It is because you cannot prove it, that such a course is pursued. And if the texts do not prove '*the fact*,' by your own confession, your texts are useless. They are not to the purpose for which you produce them." Reply, &c., p. 132, 133.

I do not agree with Mr. Balfour on some important subjects. I can nevertheless recommend his writings as containing much interesting and instructive matter on the heathenish errors which he combats; particularly his First and Second Inquiry, and his Reply to Professor Stuart's Essays.

The Bishop concludes his Note as follows. "The necessary conclusion, then, must be, that the smoke of future torment will ascend up *for ever and ever!* That this was the universal sentiment of the Fathers (with the exception of Origen), is shown by Whitby, on Heb. vi. 2. That the doctrine is consonant to *reason*, as well as Scripture, appears from its having been held by Greeks, Romans, and Jews, and indeed by the whole civilized world." *Valeant quantum valere possunt!* As to the former authority, it is that of men, who show themselves, by their *inventions* and *innovations*, to be among the first, if not the very first, corrupters of Christianity; who advocate the worship of *saints* and veneration of *reliques;* and then, adding sophistry to fraud, when brought into repute, upon the credit of their testimony as holy and religious men, who urge this very repute as an argument of their truth! See Hales's Chronology, Vol. III. p. 382. But, were it even otherwise, the Bible is as open to us as to the Fathers, and is now more intelligently studied than at any former period; and, as to the latter, or that of "Greeks, Romans, Jews, and the whole civilized world," it is, when weighed in the balance of the Sanctuary, found to be equally wanting. I shall say a few words on each. 1. As to the Greeks and Romans, we learn from the better authority of the great apostle to the Gentiles, that "professing themselves to be wise, they became fools," (Rom. i. 22,) addicted to the most senseless idolatry, and the most degrading vices. Indeed, the Bishop's appeal to Gentile *reason* is not very consistent with his adopted explanation of the "reprobate mind," (ver. 28,) to which God had judicially abandoned them—αδοκιμον . . . "'unfit to discharge the offices of the mind.' Thus God permitted them to be punished by that wherein they had sinned. And as they had abused their *mind*, so God permitted it to become *insulsa*—the state of those who are befooled or infatuated." Such is the Bishop's account of Gentile *reason*. 2. As to the Jews, the teachers whom they preferred to our Lord and his apostles, were "blind leaders of the blind," who "made the word of God of no effect by their traditions." 3. As to the whole civilized world, the assertion is much too general; but, even if strictly true, it is no recommendation of any opinion to say, that it is held by Turks, Hindoos, Chinese, Buddhists, and the like. In opposition therefore to all such authorities, I think it superabundantly proved, that the prevalent doctrine is neither consonant to *right* reason, nor to rightly interpreted Scripture; and deeply lament the obstinacy with which so many continue to maintain it, and the apathy with which they contemplate its horrors.

R. R.

JEREMIAH WHITE.

VOLUMES have been filled by hundreds about the great men, whom every body knows. One would rejoice as he that hath found great spoil, to find one on the great unknown—the illustrious obscure. The bare fact that they left the world without anxiety respecting its future —that they were willing to die body and name together—that they could go down full of great thoughts which they had no care to utter: this simple fact has a kind of greatness about it, to our fancy, which makes us curious about them.

These men, who lived in quiet and died the same, strike us by contrast.

There is an abundance of feverish littleness among men, who imagine if they have a thought, that it is new ; will amaze the world, if not turn it upside down ; and be an irreparable loss to it, if the thought should perish with them.

And there is an abundance of great littleness or little greatness, which lives in public ; which has no closet, no undress, no privacy ; which never appeals to solitude, nor to the still depths of the soul. It appeals to the PUBLIC, not to the MAN. It is always on stilts—always before your eyes—you cannot evade or escape it. "The rail," the assembly, the market, are all full of it.

And there are great men, whom none may question ; but who are, most of them, so far away from us, that we cannot reach them. A thousand questions one would fain put to them, suggested by the yearnings of one's secret nature ; but one cannot find an opportunity or a pretext. They wrote for the world, but not for us.

Now it is delightful to find a great man just great enough ; one that we can take liberties with ; that does not remind us continually of our littleness ; nay, that has little thoughts like ourselves, and moreover feels himself little, and is not dissatisfied nor angry to die like other little people. Such there are, who have written as it were by accident, and thought nothing more about the matter ; who never troubled themselves about posterity, never were curious at all as to what men hereafter would think or say of them ; who thought, if they thought at all, that posterity would find enough to do without them, and be busy enough to know nothing and care nothing about them. There are great men who have been little enough to write because they felt, and for no other reason ; and who wrote just what and as they felt, and having done that ceased.

May we be fortunate enough to meet with what they wrote ! And then give us a solitary, sunny "bank, whereon the wild thyme grows;" or a cheerful hearth and bright fire with curtains close, while wind and rain and darkness settle matters their own way without. These are all at once forgotten, and all else of this daily turbulence, called life. This is happiness ; which makes none unhappy to procure it, and which none needs envy.

Just such happiness was ours, when, the other day, Providence threw in our path "The Restoration of All Things, or a Vindication of the Goodness and Grace of God, to be manifested at last in the Recovery of His Whole Creation out of their Fall, by Jeremiah White." It was a name we had never heard ; but his theme was one very dear to us.

The words of the title struck a note, to which our whole being responded. Precious, above all treasures, had been to us the hope, that, in the fulness of time, God, in the plenitude of his wisdom, would make known how He could be just, and yet "recover His whole creation out of their fall." "*His whole creation*," we soliloquized as we ran over the title, "that is glorious. That is just what we want—just what we have long sought. You must be a glorious fellow, with what we call a great soul, that such a thought could bury itself and fructify therein. There can be no lack of room in it. We are quite sure there is nothing narrow about it; none of that odium theologicum, which takes such a strange, wild pleasure in anathemas; which carefully appropriates heaven to itself, and then coolly and remorselessly drowns immortal souls by millions for ages in succession." And we hurried home with our prize, and gaily stirred the fire, and were glad to see everything. It had always seemed to us a curious feature in man, especially in Christian man, that he should plead for eternal torments, magnified to a degree that would glut the appetite of the most insatiable fiend in existence, and touch the heart of the merest devil, if devils have hearts; and, when the love of God was opposed to him, should take refuge in His justice, alleging that we could not understand His love which included justice, and was not a *weak* love like ours; and, inventing numberless subterfuges to evade Love, should insist on reconciling conflicting passages, or passages *apparently* conflicting, on the side of justice and eternal misery. Why, if there is a doubt, we asked ourselves, why not give poor suffering man the benefit of it? Why not take the side of Love and say that our notions of *justice* are wrong; and sadly, sadly too cruel—too full of flames, and brimstone, and eternal superhuman and inhuman horrors. And yet it is not so. This shocking doctrine is repugnant to man's idea of justice; and he is obliged, in order to defend it, to have recourse to discoveries to be made in eternity. In that wonderful state, the saints are somehow to acquire the power of looking on the inconceivable tortures of their friends, and families and neighbours, knowing that their duration will measure the measureless eternity,--and remaining unmoved, wrapped up in their own glory, and comfortable in their own safety, they will see these tortures—always see them—throughout eternity see them—yet never feel a secret sorrow, never shed a pitying tear. And all for what? Because God, for his own mere pleasure, created these myriads of immortals to be vessels of wrath. If there be on earth a doctrine of devils, it is this. We challenge its advocates to produce anything more blasphemous, from any religion that ever was professed by man since the world began. This never can be, we have ever said—but to *ourselves;* for, to have doubted eternal misery and tortures, would, according to our teachers, have been to bring them certainly upon us—this never can be: whatever Christianity may say, it does not, it cannot mean this. And great was our delight to find, that there were others who thought as we did, and that they had written as they had thought. Any one can judge how the book was devoured; and any one who will take the trouble to read it, will be able to judge how it was enjoyed.

But who was Jeremiah White? Was he a Christian? Was he a Protestant? Was he not a Socinian? It is very little that any one knows about him, and we are almost glad of it; for we can take the

meagre outline which survives him, and fill it up according to our own pleasure. But we know enough to answer such questions as these. Jeremiah White was not a Socinian. He was a Protestant. He was a Christian. And he was Chaplain to one of the greatest men the world ever saw: Oliver Cromwell. This is not quite, but almost all, we can say about him; that most, we fear, would care to know. For too many, in religious as in worldly affairs, are influenced by the *accidents* of the man. There are however one or two little incidents, preserved by his friends, which have great interest for us. We are told, by his Editor, in the first edition of the book in question, that "when he was at the University, (Trinity College, Cambridge, of which he was a Fellow,) and had studied all the schemes of divinity, he could not find from any that God was *good*, that God was *Love*, as the Scriptures declare of him. This put him into a great dissatisfaction and perplexity of mind, from which he could no way extricate himself; but it grew upon him more and more, till it threw him into a fit of sickness, and that so dangerous that there were no hopes of his recovery; but in it, at the worst, he had a beam of divine grace darted upon his intellect, with a sudden, warm, and lively impression, which gave him immediately a new set of thoughts concerning God and his works, and the way of his dealing with his offending creatures; which, as they became the rule and standard of all his thoughts and measures of things afterwards, as I have heard him declare, so they gave in particular the ground and occasion of his present design. And upon this he presently recovered."

Now, we have no hesitation in saying, that we love him more, and honour him more highly, for this exquisite sensibility than we should had he written Hamlet or the Principia. Yes, all honour to him who could not live with the thought within him, that God did not love, and love for ever, the workmanship of his hands! That is like Christianity; it is its own evidence; the likeness of its Author was stamped upon him: it was no word-love, which the act belied; but good-will and boundless charity, so deeply in his heart, that it must needs break, if it cannot find scope, and wander without let or hindrance. We can sooner believe *that* Christianity, that cannot live if men must die—that, like St. Paul, could wish itself accursed for its brethren's sake—than that which hopes to see to all eternity, the hopeless misery of unnumbered millions, that its own blessedness may be thereby effectually secured.* How such strange, such barbarous, such savage sentiments, have survived so long—how Protestantism can so long tolerate a dogma so dark, that nothing darker can be found in the deepest darkness of the ages of darkness, is to us a mystery. There is nothing so cruel in Popery. And there is nothing, and there never has been since the world began anything, in the most revolting of human creeds, so utterly devilish and inhuman as the belief now prevalent in this country, that God made the majority of mankind for no other purpose than to punish them to all eternity; to which he has decreed them, and which they have no power to escape.

NOHDÖRN.

(To be continued.)

* Every reader knows, that it is a common opinion among Christians, that the misery of the unbelievers will most likely be one great means of perpetuating the happiness of the blest.

Extract from an Unpublished Work—"Man and his Maker." By Edward Cock, of Stonehouse, Devon.

We feel persuaded, also, that the works of God, as *a whole* or *in parts*, could never have been pronounced by the Infinitely Wise and Truthful Jehovah as "good," if the degenerating scheme of "*Endless Misery*" be really true. An Omnipotent, all-wise, and benevolent Creator gave man on earth all things richly to enjoy, (1 Tim. vi. 17,) as a type of his native *liberality* and the *universality* of his ultimate bestowment of *spiritual* life, light, and joy. (1 Tim. ii. 4.) This is given to man *consistently with* "*Infinite Justice*," of course, notwithstanding he is *a sinner;* and, consequently, it must be *the first instalment* of the boundless blessings purchased on "*the cross*,"—(John xii. 32)—*the first intimation* of God's universal "reconciliation to the world," (2 Cor. v. 19,)—"the *first-fruits*" of the after *harvest*, (James i. 18) of endless riches, reward, and bliss, to *God's* "*creatures*" *as a whole*. It must be admitted as an *axiom* that God in nature cannot be *contrary* to God in grace—or Redemption. *Both* are absolutely *identical*, or neither, by Christian logic, can be proved to exist. Now, in nature there is *no bane without an appropriate antidote*. Every night has its morning dawn! Every winter has its spring of beauty, blossom, and perfume! The fearful white squall is "but for a moment—so soon passeth it away, and it is gone!" The pelting, pitiless thunder-storm is succeeded by its smiling, beaming, revivifying hour of joy and song! and the lovely rainbow upon the blackened distance tells of "peace on earth and good will towards men!" Where, we ask, in all the broad bosom of nature, does God appear the vindictive, unvaried, relentless tormentor of his frail, erring, but *dependent* creatures? "The Father" is written on all his acts, throughout all time, in all space, as well as truly emblazoned in *his word!* Where on earth see we *thorns and briers*, and find no *bud, berry, bloom or flower?* Where the bee sting, sharp and painful, without the honey, sweet and mellow? The henbane, the deadly nightshade, the arsenic, the prussic acid,—where, *without a cure?* Yea, more, where are things incapable themselves of being even *a most effective antidote* to a thousand ills to which man is born and flesh is heir? . . . . Man breaks the natural laws; the breach gives him *pain!* For *what?* Why to *caution* kindly, but lightly, against *another and more ruinous offence!* Nature, how *remedial* is she! See how she asks, seeks, labours, for one single aim—*perfection!* In all her kingdoms—vegetable, animal, mineral—she has only one great, simple, kindly, grand purpose—*perfection!* All are alike *conducive and tributary* to the great divine doctrine, "*Goodwill to man!*" O, were we intimately conversant with God's infinite wisdom and unbounded goodness, as manifested "*in all his works*," how enlarged would be our views of the ever-present, ever-merciful "Upholder of all things!" We dwell on the obvious fact that there can be nothing his hand hath made, however *minute*, that he designs not to *felicitate* and *protect*, by his paternal care, against all conspiring evils, from his inexhaustible, ever-bountiful warehouse of *love!* We are lost in *wonder*, while we

breathlessly *adore!* What innumerable millions of insignificant, defenceless and unwitting creatures are provided with *competent instincts*, which in their earliest, yea their *first* moments, taught them to feel their wants, and procure their supplies! Let us, then, fearlessly ask, *what has God not amply provided for?* The poor, trembling, bitten reptile knows the *instant remedy*, and, divinely taught by irresponsible instinct, seeks the certain balm from its appropriate leaf—a leaf *well known to it*, but wholly *unknown*, perchance, *to all beside!* With even the *minutiæ* of creation man cannot compete for *unimprovable skill.* The little bird of the air knows well its "times and seasons,"—*when* to build, *how* to build, and *where* to build; and *when*, *how*, and *where* to *feed;* and then to *migrate*,—when its work be done! Instinct to them is "*the finger of God:*"—unimprovable, unvariable, ever-competent, all-perfect—*like himself!* This is "the gift of God" to even his meanest creatures; "the *first fruits*"—as we have said—the prophetic prelude of the mightier powers and the more glorious, expansive, energetic influences yet to be shed, and shed for ever, on his nobler creature *man!* Are not all these mere puny creatures, and ten thousand millions more, ever marked, ever watched, by the Divine Eye? Are not, we ask, all animal, all intelligent natures, panting for one boon—one object—*happiness?* What creature does not? It is the very hope of seraphs, the very aim of moths, and the entire object of *all between!* We would calmly, reverently ask, *why* should the Supreme *stop* in his all-bountiful provision for the wants of his creatures with the merely instinctive *brute*, and the unconscious *flower*, when *man*, evidently destined to *endless existence*, is, as some deem, blindly to plunge into a chaos of *being*, and endless multiciplicity of *trials*, when his very most important "wants" are never to be met, never to be supplied, viz.: *Security, and ultimate happiness, for his frail and misguided soul?* Is he not equally *wretched* as they?—*dependent* as they?—*helpless* as they?—*subservient* as they? We demand would *analogy* admit of the "orthodox" conclusion? *Is "the poor blind creature of a day" to stand alone, as the isolated instance of God his Father's improvident procedure on his behalf*—the only mark for the arrows of his *wrath*, when *all else claims and enjoys* his paternal mercy, provision, and control? Man only the exception to the general rule! when he is the most *important*, the *ultimate* object concerned? Man alone divinely *unprovided for!* when his wants are *infinite*, *essential*, *numerous*, *spiritual*, *eternal?* Man! when that *provision* would be the unending source of boundless glory to his Maker, God, and to his Saviour, Christ? yea, would entail his own plenitude of bliss in God's plenitude of praise? May we not hence say with our Divine Redeemer, "If God so clothed the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, how much more shall he not clothe you, O ye of little faith?"—"*How much more*" shall he not provide for wants which ye cannot provide for yourselves? *present* wants! *eternal* wants! wants for this world, and wants for that which is to come? "How much more?" O! "how much more?"

"But," say some, "Man is a great *sinner!* and thereby he has forfeited, at the hand of God, this analogous *provision!* We reply, *And Christ is a great Saviour, and has more than recovered it! yea, his*

"*salvation,*" *universal and complete, is the very provision made!* (John x. 10.) Had man not been *a sinner*, he would not have required such a "provision" for his "recovery;" *but being a sinner, and needing salvation, God acted towards him as he does to all other of his creatures and provided for him all he needed, when he was utterly unable to provide for himself!* Here we deem the *analogy* is perfect. All creation joins the eternal and unexceptionable chorus—"He openeth his hand and satisfieth the desire of *every living thing!*" (Ps. cxlv. 16.) "The Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice!" Amen! and Amen!

POETRY.

"Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in Victory."

How sweet to think—when life is o'er,
And past to us each earthly scene,
Not human life does God restore,
But makes us more than we have been!

He gives not then what Adam lost,
The sinless soul, the nature pure:
We enter Heaven at nature's cost,
But gain a life from change secure.

There Incorruption doth abide
With Immortality combin'd;
For there the body glorified
Enshrines the Spirit—not the mind.

How sweet our privilege to know,
And love's constraining power to feel;
To live in heaven while here below,
Secure of our eternal weal.

Thus can we view the empty show
Of this world's talent, rank, and fame;
Nor long their earth-born joys to know,
Nor court their praise, nor dread their blame.

We Kings and Priests to God shall reign,
O'er self on earth, with him above,
Till sov'reignty and pow'r shall gain
Elected souls made new by love.

The Saviour's foes, and Death the last
And strongest, at his feet must fall,
Before Christ's kingly reign is past
And God appears as all in all!

None shall the power of Death detain,
None Hades' deeper shade shall hide;
Wash'd in Christ's blood from every stain,
All live again in Him who died.

Then shall the voice of praise arise
Triumphant through the heavenly space;
One glorious anthem fill the skies,
Its theme—our God's Redeeming Grace!

A Universalist.

THE VOICELESS VOICE.

Come, thou voiceless voice, and read me,
For thy tones are very sweet,
Cool and calm, and most refreshing
As are rain-drops after heat.

Read! of lusty David's pebble
At the grim Goliah hurled;
Read, and nerve my soul for action
'Gainst that Philistine the world.

Read! of cloud and orient pillar
Guiding Judah's swarthy band,
Read! and Thou, Great Presence! shew me,
Through the desert, Canaan's land.

Read! of Jesus, God Incarnate,
On the cross who died to save;
Read! and let my sins be buried
There with him in Joseph's grave.

Read again! reveal him risen,
Seal'd though tomb, and watch though set;
Read! and thou, my winged nature,
Mount with Him from Olivet.

Read! cnerimson'd lamps are burning,
Praise, and hymn, and incense given;
Read on, and *as* thou readest, draw me
Within yon spanless blue of heaven!

O Voice, yet voiceless One, who art thou,
That lute-like thus canst charm my strife?
Spirit! God! 'tis Thou that readest,
And the page is that of Life.

George Hopeall.

REVIEWS.

THE SOUL; HER SORROWS AND HER ASPIRATIONS. By FRANCIS WILLIAM NEWMAN, formerly Fellow of Baliol College, Oxford. Second Edition. London: *John Chapman, Strand.* 1849.

(*Concluded from p.* 65.)

As a suitable finale to the system which we have just been attempting to sketch and characterise, in the fifth place, Mr. Newman avows himself to be in a state of the most perfect uncertainty with regard to the existence and enjoyment of a future life. Many arguments, he conceives, show it to be not impossible that we shall live hereafter; (we beg his pardon, that "all spiritually enlightened souls, all that are capable of obeying and rejoicing in God"—shall do so;) but these are counteracted and neutralized by so many others, that "confidence" in the subject "there is none, and hopeful aspiration is her" the soul's "highest state." Not that this state of uncertainty is productive in him of any uneasiness. Not that it interferes in any degree with the vigour of his *spiritual* life, or the progress towards perfection of his resistance to bodily suggestions of evil. Far from it. His very despair constitutes, if we are to believe him, one indispensable ingredient in his moral grandeur and strength. The account which he gives of his own state of mind, distressing as it is, is too curious and instructive not to be transferred to our pages. A future life, says he, "remains as a thing not *manifestly refused by God.*" (The italics are ours.) "For this, therefore, from time to time, the spirit within pleads, and knows that it will be accepted," (query how does it know this?) "*even if the prayer be ignorant.** Still, unless some clear conviction can be gained, that the thing asked," a future life, "is *according to the will of God*, the soul cannot have confidence that the petition will be fulfilled; and to ascertain this by direct vision is (to me hitherto) impossible; for to our blind eyes many things seem easy which Almighty wisdom knows cannot be granted: and while the intellect hesitates on this point, the soul dares not to dogmatize. Confidence thus there is none, and hopeful † aspiration is her highest state. But then there is herein,"—in absolute uncertainty as to future existence,—"*nothing whatever to distress her*: no cloud of grief crosses the area of her vision, as she gazes upward; for, *if her Lord, infinite in love and wisdom, sees that it cannot be, she herself could not wish it.*" (The italics are Mr. Newman's.) That is, COULD NOT WISH A FUTURE LIFE. Tolerably cool and philosophic, no doubt. "While in such vigour of life as to have any insight into God's mind, she is also in vigour enough to trample selfishness under foot." Self trampling on self; Satan casting out Satan! Odd enough. "In fact, it would not be selfish merely, but silly, to fret that odd cannot be even, nor a creature be as its Creator; and nothing short of difficulty insuperable as this, would lead," Mr. Newman being judge, "to the refusal of *so holy and simple a desire.*"—pp. 236, 237. Reader, are you astonished? Does it occur to you to enquire, how it is possible for a man of clear, acute, and comprehensive intellect, such as Mr. Newman unquestionably possesses, to sit down contented with a state of things, which, for aught he knows, may terminate the very next moment in his utter annihilation? Except by assuming the existence and influence of a state of the most awful self-delusion,—a state in which the individual readily, and even delightedly, believes *the lie*,—we can afford no satisfaction in the matter. He says, that this "state of *Aspiration*," after a barely *possible* future life, to which alone he has attained, "is perhaps the very best thing for me,

* That is, as appears, a prayer that cannot be granted. In what, then, does acceptance consist?
† Despondingly, it strikes us, would be the more appropriate term.

until some other conditions of soul are fulfilled, in which as yet I am deficient." He seems to find comfort in our cherishing, "concerning all spiritually enlightened souls," precisely the same hopes that we cherish "concerning ourselves." And in the true spirit of ancient Stoicism, which our author has studied, and with which evidently he is in no small measure imbued, he stimulates his friends and adherents to well-doing, and to "the casting of their souls on him who careth for them,"—strange enough, as proceeding from him—by the consideration, that whether there be a future state of existence, or not, we shall at all events have our virtuous and praiseworthy conduct *for its own reward!* "Suffice it ourselves to live with God now, if haply we may live with him to all eternity: or, at any rate, let us love him while we live, and live only to be conformed to *his will*." That is, of course, as previously explained, to *our own will*, which, in his opinion, is a spiritual and divine principle. "For if an eternity of holy obedience is infinite bliss"—still the idea of law existing in heaven—"it can only be because every day of obedience is bliss. We therefore do not need the promise of such an eternity," mark the pride of unbelief, as well as misrepresentation of Scripture, which dictates this sentiment, "as any bribe to be obedient and loving now: but either Heaven is an empty name and foolish delusion, or it is a Heaven on Earth to be God's true servants." That is, to serve our own wills, enlightened *from within*. The whole winding up with the following awful perversion of Scripture language, extracted, by the way, from the writings of that *bad reasoner*, and *defective metaphysician*, Paul:—"In any case, therefore, it remains, to rest our souls on a faithful Creator, knowing"—how?—"that whether we live, we live unto Him, or whether we die, we die unto Him. Living, therefore, or dying, we are His." p. 238. That is, let us cherish the proud feeling, (how the spirit of the ancient stoics does work in our author!) that, upon earth, and under circumstances of peculiar difficulty, we have done good—that we have, influenced by heavenly principles resident in our own nature, engaged in heavenly practices corresponding thereto—and that we have, as in certain respects the *ἰσοι Θεῷ, the equals of God*, by our virtues, laid him under some sort of obligation to us—and there let us leave the matter. If he give us a future life, well; we shall receive it, in that case, as in some respects, our due: but if not, then, with the consciousness of our having attained to something *divine in our own nature*, and of our having thus placed ourselves on a par with God himself, *we can afford to do without it*. Such, we respectfully submit, is without any exaggeration whatever, a fair and truthful account of Mr. Newman's views and feelings respecting futurity. We can, without any great difficulty, picture to ourselves, what would have been his thoughts and what his conduct, had he, along with his brethren, the ancient Stoics, stood on Mars-Hill, at Athens, and heard that "babbler," (*σπερμολογος*) and absurd metaphysician, Paul, discourse concerning "Jesus and the Resurrection." See Acts xvii. Amiable, gentle, and self-controlled, as our author confessedly is, could he, holding the sentiments which he does, have abstained from joining in the "mockings"—"the jeers and scoffs"—wherewith the propounder of the divine doctrine of mediation was so profusely greeted? Melancholy, most melancholy is the state of mind which the preceding extracts discover. And, equally melancholy the results to which our author's theory obviously conducts him. The declarations of God speaking peace to the guilty conscience, and inspiring the hope of a blessed immortality, scornfully rejected; and this, in order to substitute for them views, of the nature and issues of which he confesses himself to be profoundly ignorant! The light of God shining forth in the Scriptures set aside, as not worthy to be compared with the lurid light of his own understanding; and as the not improbable recompense of following this his self-elected guide, *the blackness of darkness for ever!* The temporary triumphs of soul over the suggestions of its bodily companion, ending as he has but too much reason to fear, in *its everlasting extinction!* Well; to classically and philosophically minded men, like Mr. Newman, all this may be very fine, and very consolatory; to them it may afford the means of stimulating and gratifying some of the

strongest feelings of the human heart. Enabled thereby to dispense with the bad logic and false metaphysics of Scripture, as well as to trample under foot its low and inadequate morality; and enabled thereby also, should there be in store for them such a place as heaven, to regard themselves as indebted for it to their own goodness, and not to the righteousness of another, and should no future life exist, easily and cheerfully to do without it; what abundant matter in all this for pride and self-exultation! Such a state of mind, and such feelings, we conceive necessarily to coexist with and to be fostered by the reception and influence of our author's theory; and yet where calmness of natural temper, cultivation of intellect, amiable dispositions, somewhat correct notions of morality, and favourable external circumstances concur, we are perfectly prepared to admit, that not only external conduct of a highly estimable description, but even much internal purity and self-control may characterize the individual. But what of mankind in general? Shall we be told that the doctrines proposed and insisted on throughout this volume, are by far too exclusively *esoteric*, ever to spread among, or exercise any deleterious influence on society? That *odi profanum vulgus, et arceo*, is written on every page; and that our modern Zeno, its author, seeks for an audience "fitting and few," only among men, able, educated, and philosophical like himself? Let the truth of this, to a certain extent, be admitted. Does it follow, however, that the result is exactly to correspond with his wishes and intentions? In an enquiring age like this, and among a population inflamed by physical suffering and political discontent, is there no risk of our author's views spreading, and being greedily embraced by thousands? And, supposing them to be so, could our author—could any one—guarantee to us, that the effect would be to render man as calm and philosophic, as contented and moral, as he and others profess themselves, under their influence, to have become? Let the doctrine that death may after all be but an "eternal sleep;" that the close of human existence is probably the extinction of our being, obtain a general hold on the minds of men, would this tend to strengthen the sense of moral obligation, or produce a disposition to make sacrifices on behalf of others? Would increased abstinence from evil follow in its train, and Utopian dreams of human excellence and felicity be thereby realized? Alas! both theory and experience proclaim, that with the prevalence of sentiments such as these, the most baleful and destructive moral influences would be associated. Blair, the author of "the Grave," more than a century ago, in the following lines, to which a most fearful point and emphasis have since been given by the circumstances which preceded and attended the first French revolution, said, and that with almost prophetic anticipation:—

> If death was nothing, and nought after death,
> If when men died, at once they ceased to be,
> Returning to the barren womb of nothing,
> Whence first they sprung; then might the debauchee
> Untrembling mouth the heavens; then might the drunkard
> Reel over his full bowl, and when 'tis drained,
> Fill up another to the brim, and laugh
> At the poor bug-bear, death; then might the wretch
> That's weary of the world, and tired of life,
> At once give each inquietude the slip,
> By stealing out of being when he pleased,
> And by what way.—Who could force
> The ill-pleased guest to sit out his full time,
> Or blame him, if he goes?

And with the risk of practical consequences such as these staring them in the face, can Mr. Newman, and men similarly minded with himself, stand justified to their own consciences, in "scattering firebrands, as in sport," among the inflammable materials of human society? Doing what in them lies to subvert *the life and immortality brought to light by the gospel*, and to substitute for such Heaven-inspired hopes, the gloomy theory of man's annihilation at death being more than probable,—success in their efforts, involving more than likelihood of the bonds of moral obligation being loosed, and society being shaken, if not even convulsed to its very centre,—is there any language strong enough,

in which, supposing such conduct to be wilful, to express our detestation of it? —Turn we, however, from a system based on falsehood and delusion, fostering pride, fraught with inconsistencies, and issuing in despair, to the Scriptures, and that *good hope through grace* which they inspire.—There instead of being oppressed by human assumptions and reasonings, by doubts, and by a proud but gloomy defiance of consequences, we find ourselves breathing an atmosphere which is divine, possessed of the absolute certainty of truth, and animated with the knowledge of our own personal interest in spiritual and heavenly blessings. —We have no longer to deal with the speculations of fleshly mind, puffed up, and labouring to intrude into regions inaccessible to mere human ken, but with divine facts, vouched for by divine testimony. Supremely important are these facts, as revealed to us in the Scriptures. Among others, we are made acquainted with the appearance in flesh of *the second man, the Lord from heaven* —with the exhibition, on his part, of perfect righteousness—with his having *put away sin, by the sacrifice of himself*—with his resurrection from the dead, and ascention to glory—and with the conferring of the divine nature upon him who had by sin previously forfeited human nature, through his oneness with that glorious personage *who died for him, and rose again.* Through such facts as these, seen to be divine, and revelations of the divine character in their own light, by all who have eyes given them to see; and as seen to be what they are, entering into the understanding and conscience, effects corresponding to their own nature are produced. Light having begotten light, 2 Cor. iv. 6, and love having begotten love, 1 John, iv. 19, holiness or separation from the world, John xvii, 17, spirituality of mind, Rom. viii. 10, heavenliness of temper and dispositions, Coloss. iii. 1, 2, and the other fruits of righteousness, Phil. i. 11, are brought forth in exact proportion to the degree in which the divine facts revealed to us, are operating upon the mind. Spirituality thus has its origin, not in us, but in God—not in the nature which we inherit from Adam, but in the divine nature imparted to us from above;—and as the divine nature is formed in us, so does it continue to influence us from first to last, by the manifestation of divine facts, through the medium of divine testimony, to a *faith which is* itself *of the operation of God.* So decidedly is this the case, that apart from *faith working by love*, produced by the scriptural revelation of divine realities, there exists not any motive power of genuine and heavenly religion.—One grand consequence of which the divine facts of which we have just been speaking are productive, in the case of every individual enlightened by them, is absolute certainty of their truth. This is a necessary result of infallible testimony being carried home to the conscience. Producing irresistible and perfect conviction of truth, such testimony gives a death blow to every species of doubt, hesitation, and uncertainty. All to whom it is given to believe it, rejoicing to know for certain God's revealed character, are content to leave scepticism in all its varied forms, to the religious Pharisee, who seeks for a ground of love in himself towards God, and to those philosophically-minded men, those modern Academics and Stoics, who conceive that doubting is essential to the assertion of mental freedom, and constitutes the index of mental superiority. *What is truth?* is not with the followers of the Lamb, as it was with Pilate of old, a question. Truth, as revealed by God in the Scriptures, and shining there by its own light, they are privileged to know; and by truth, as known, their words and whole demeanour are moulded and regulated. When men would, in opposition to the divine testimony, impose upon them shallow sophisms and mere human theories, such as we find in the pages of Mr. Newman, they are sceptical enough; but whenever God speaks, and by means of what he is pleased to say, communicates to them an illumination that is heavenly and divine, all doubt and hesitation instantly vanish, being swallowed up in that absolute and infallible certainty which has taken possession of their minds. Divine truth thus in them produces a divine result. Contrast the doubts respecting immortality and other topics of a kindred nature, expressed by the speakers in Plato's *Phædo*, and Cicero's *Tusculan Questions*,—doubts in their case legitimate enough, and emanating from some of the greatest minds of antiquity—with the following language,

which the poor, illiterate, and despised of this world, if *rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom*, at once and unhesitatingly adopt and employ as their own; and then let the most inveterate champion of infidelity, the most deadly opponent of the inspiration of the Scriptures say, if parties influenced by a divine and infallible testimony—supposing such a testimony to exist—could have expressed themselves otherwise? *We* BELIEVE, AND ARE SURE, *that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.* John vi. 69. WE KNOW *that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life.* 1 John, v. 20. WE KNOW *that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.* 2 Cor. v. 1. *It doth not yet appear what we shall be; but* WE KNOW, *that when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is.* 1 John, iii. 2—And yet, this is not all: divine facts, made known in the Scriptures, and shining into our minds by their own light, are not only legitimately productive in us of absolute certainty, but, as may be observed from the language of the foregoing quotations, they always manifest themselves to us as divine and true, by being of the nature of blessings which are enjoyed by ourselves. Believing the truth of the facts, we necessarily believe them as facts in which we ourselves have a personal and indefeasible interest. *This is the record*, or testimony, *that God hath given* TO US *eternal life; and this life is in his Son.* 1 John, v. 11. Eternal life, an attribute of the divine nature, and the highest possible of all blessings is it thus appears, not proposed as a reward to be earned, or "a bribe" to stimulate to acts of self-righteousness, but as a privilege already bestowed; is revealed, not as what we may or may not have an interest in, but as a fact in which, as one with Christ Jesus, we are already personally concerned—as a privilege indeed, which, through our Lord's righteousness ,was bestowed on us, in the divine purpose, before the world began. Faith, we thus discover, is not the crediting of abstract truths, with which we ourselves may have nothing to do; but, wherever it exists, implies an infallible conviction, that the blessings revealed to us in the divine testimony, are blessings in which we ourselves participate: this our personal concern in them, constituting an essential and indispensable element of that divine light by means of which, as true, they shine into our minds. *We have peace with God*, because, believing the Scriptures, we see ourselves *washed from our sins in the blood of the Lamb;* we are animated with *joy that is unspeakable and full of glory*, because, through faith, we see ourselves clothed upon with the Redeemer's righteousness and partakers of his life. One mistake in regard to this subject, it is proper to advert to and obviate. The whisper of some private spirit, making that to be true which was not true before, and addressed to our minds independently of the Scriptures, is not the source of that knowledge of our having a personal interest in heavenly blessings for which we contend. On the contrary, it is solely through the public declarations of God in the Scriptures, revealing facts in which others, as well as ourselves, are concerned—facts which continue to be so, whether believed in or not;—it is merely through our being given to hear the glad tidings which God makes known in the Scriptures, addressed as they really are to ourselves, that there is conveyed to us a divine conviction of the Scriptures being true, and of the revelations which they contain having a reference to our own spiritual and eternal well-being. To know the Scriptures as true, is thus to know them as having been so before we believed them; and to know them as true, is to know them as revealing blessings of which, in Christ Jesus, we have already been put in possession. Our belief, therefore, does not make the Scriptures to be true: it merely brings us to the knowledge of them as true previous to our believing; and this, through bringing us to the knowledge of our personal interest in the glorious facts which they reveal. Jesus *is* our Saviour; through faith we know him to be so. So essential to the existence of all genuine and spiritual religion, is the discovery to us of facts as divine, in the light of our own personal interest in these facts, that the certain knowledge of God's having given to us

eternal life through Christ Jesus, is the very commencement of spirituality in our minds,—is the principle by which at every step of our Christian career that life is upheld,—and is the only source from which, in our case, can flow effects which are heavenly and divine. It may suit Mr. Newman, and persons like-minded with himself, to sneer at "a clear prospect of eternity" as calculated to "produce lapses into unconcern, and irreverent self-conceit, with all its train of abominations;" p. 237; nor do we intend to deny, that, in those who know the truth, such unlovely and unchristian features of mind do but too frequently make their appearance. To the object of our author's idolatry, however, the human soul or will,—a principle which is enmity against God, and the constant source of evil—we would unhesitatingly ascribe all such exhibitions as those which he condemns,—and condemns properly,—and not to that despised *truth as it is in Jesus*, which, as pure and heavenly in itself, can only be productive, of pure and heavenly effects. In spite of all our author's assertions and insinuations to the contrary—aided, although in hazarding them, he may be by the Church of Rome and hollowhearted Protestants—we would maintain, and in proof of our averment would be content to abide by the test of experience, that by the certain knowledge of Christ as our righteousness and life, and by this knowledge alone, are the pride, self-conceit, and irreverence of the human mind put down and crucified. Christianity, by imparting to us the absolute certainty of God having given us eternal life through the divine righteousness of his own Son, is the only principle by which the bias to seek for something good in ourselves, and thereby to blind ourselves to our real condition before God, is taken off our minds—the only principle by which, being enabled to look at ourselves as what we really are, vile, sinful, and condemned in the sight of God, and to set our seals intelligently and approvingly to the sentence which God hath seen meet to pronounce upon us, true humility is, or can be produced; Christianity alone, by shewing us the divine nature as ours in the Son of God glorified, and human nature as put off in his death, is productive of that loathing of creature self, whether mental or bodily—that abhorrence of human nature in all its tendencies and actings—which is practically exhibited in our *denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, and living righteously, soberly, and godly in this present evil world.*—But we cannot stop here. Mr. Newman having challenged a comparison between the influence exerted over the mind, by his own classical, elegant, and humanly-devised system, and that exerted by the Scriptures, we at once and advisedly take up his challenge, and "turn on him the tables." Talks he of "self conceit, with all its train of abominations," being engendered by the revelation to any one of eternal life being his? Why, we tell him, that ignorantly and unintentionally no doubt, but truly, he is describing some of the more prominent features, not of God's religion, but of his own. His own system, under whatever external polish and apparent modesty it may strive to veil the fact, is essentially antagonistic to humility: setting up human power, human holiness, and human perfection; and in order to make of them a pedestal for its idol, casting down the power, righteousness, and perfection of God, it exhibits the most arrogant self-conceit and daring presumption. However *highly esteemed it may be among men*, it is indeed *an abomination in the sight of God.* It is, as we have already seen, a system of self-righteousness similar to that in which Saul of Tarsus indulged and prided himself before his conversion: producing, in every age, wherever it exists, effects corresponding to those, which made their appearance in "the chief of sinners." Such being the case, are we to be told that pride the most deadly and offensive in the sight of God, can be productive of humility? that self-denial can be the offspring of self-worship? How monstrous the idea, that a system like that of Mr. Newman, which avowedly renders him indifferent to heaven and his own future enjoyment of it, and enables him to find in the self-righteous actings of his own soul, a perfectly satisfactory heaven upon earth—a system which, leading him, Nebuchadnezzar-like, to rejoice in the Babylon of creature holiness which he himself hath built, makes him proudly

contrast the beautiful disinterestedness of his own principles and actions, as operating and performed without any reference to a reward, with that mean and sneaking religion which the Scriptures, by means of "the bribe" of eternal life would establish—how monstrous, we say, the idea, that such a system should be the cause of his mortifying a pride which it necessarily feeds and strengthens—should cause him to aim at the destruction of a self-conceit, a self-importance, and a self-idolatry, which notoriously constitute its very essence!

Such is an outline, and such do we conceive to be a csriptural refutation, of Mr. Newman's theory. After every allowance made, and in spite of its utter hollowness and falsehood, the consistency of this theory with itself is really surprising. No doubt the great abilities, especially the acuteness and powers of reflection possessed by its author, and that sharpening of his faculties to spy quickly the minutest absurdities in doctrine and evils in practice which an acquaintance with the letter of Scripture, and with popular systems of religion, far superior to what we ordinarily meet with in persons of his class, have unconsciously to himself been effecting, do in no small degree serve to account for this. Still the great, certainly *not perfect* self-consistency of his views, is a sort of literary and theological phenomenon. According to him, the creature himself is, from internal light and in the assertion of his own fancied free will, the sole actor throughout the whole of his religious career; and is able, by the exercise of his own volitions, to advance step by step from one degree of perfection to another. Self-reliance is his grand characteristic. As its results, in the form of increasing success, gradually develop themselves, he becomes increasingly of course both better pleased with it, and on better terms with himself. And why not? He has actually succeeded in accomplishing, what the Scriptures declare no creature can do, his own emancipation from the love and thraldom of sin! And done so, by his own innate energies and love of truth and goodness, without having allowed himself to be bribed by any prospect of an hereafter! Need we, under such circumstances, wonder at our author's indulging in the language of exultation and triumph over a book like the Bible, the main statements of which he has, in his own experience, been enabled practically to refute? If the doctrine of mediation be by him scoffed at, loathed and rejected, and the doctrine of methodistic perfection be by him approved of and recommended to general adoption, has he not shewn himself able to dispense with the one, and to achieve the other? Instead of stooping to be indebted to one Jesus for *having washed away his sins in his own blood*, accordiug to the requirements of an "illogical, mischievous and immoral theory," he has bravely confided in the dictates of his own truthful internal light prescribing to him to bring himself and his sins directly to God, for the purpose of having these sins by a direct act of the divine goodness put away; and having, by means of satisfying himself that God must be the friend of one capable of acting a part so resolute and praiseworthy, experienced the blessedness of setting the Scriptures,—their doctrines, promises, and threatenings,—at defiance, is it to be wondered at, if we find him going on his way rejoicing? True, his premises *may be* wrong; and if so, his practical conclusions from them *must be* incontestably and awfully false. Having assumed the infallibility of his own internal light, everything depends on the correctness of this assumption; but having placed himself under its pilotage, and having found it capable of tiding him safely, satisfactorily and triumphantly over the plainest declarations of a book so illogical in its reasonings, and so degrading in its morality, as the Sacred Scriptures, why should he abandon it, even when rocks and breakers shew themselves a-head, towards the close of his perilous course? Doubts, perplexities and anxieties as to the result, it cannot be denied, will in spite of every precaution arise. In Mr. Newman's mind it is but too apparent they are not awanting. Nothing, however, in such a case, like a desperate plunge. And nothing so desirable and advantageous, when one is determined on making it, as to try to hide from oneself the enormity of

one's guilt, or the hideousness of one's folly, by some little piece of plausible and convenient sophistry.

> What Cato did, and Addison approved,
> Cannot be wrong;

are said to have been the words written, and left on his desk, by the nephew of the great Essayist, (himself one of the writers in the "Spectator,") just before quitting his house to throw himself into the Thames. Can a light within, in the pursuit of which we have had evinced to us the freedom of man's will, and the essential purity and dignity of human nature—by obeying the dictates of which, sin in us has been got rid of, the stirrings of fleshly emotions have been overcome, and perfection has been attained to—and, above all, by means of the searching disclosures of which, the falsehood of the Scriptures, as claiming to have proceeded from divine inspiration, has been exposed, and the better class of mankind set free from the imposture—be an unsafe guide to follow, even although its last act should be to plunge us over the precipice of unbelief into the gulf of annihilation?—which is a perfectly fair abstract of the logic, and especially of the practical conclusion of Mr. Newman's book, (see pp. 233—238,) so closely resembles the above quoted reasoning of Budgell, that one is almost tempted to enquire, whether or not it was intended that the one should be a sort of amplification of the other?

Minor objections to the statements contained and the views propounded in Mr. Newman's book, might be made in great abundance. But after opposing the untenable and anti-scriptural character of the principles which lie at the foundation of his theory, and the awful consequences to which, when followed out, these principles inevitably and avowedly lead, why trouble ourselves with points of subordinate interest and importance? No doubt many other mistakes of our author, besides those to which we have alluded, deserve notice and animadversion. When, for instance, he ascribes sex to soul,—asserting that some souls are male and some female,—without entering into the question, nay, without even disputing the correctness of his view of the subject, it is quite sufficient to observe that, under such circumstances, even by his own shewing, *soul* is not *spirit:* it holding true to the latter, that sex, no less than age, rank and clime, is to it a distinction utterly unknown. *There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither* MALE *nor* FEMALE; *for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.*—Gal. iii. 28.—If he assert that "God has two families of children on this earth; *the once born*, and *the twice born;* both obedient, both reverential, both imperfect, each essential to the other," p. 140, it may be responded briefly, that the application of the term *twice born* to parties possessed all the while of nothing more than *human nature*, however readily it might be allowed to pass in a work of pure fiction, is too arbitrary to be admissible in one professing to deal with facts and realities: the whole view being still farther objectionable on the ground of Scripture confining the rank of God's children to those born a second time from above, and thereby *made partakers of* the earnest of *the divine nature*, 2 Pet. i. 4; and, so far from ascribing "obedience" and "reverence" to the *once born*, of its representing them as "*disobedient*," "haters of God," and "*to every good work reprobate.*"—When our author says, "To those who were religious, but not spiritual," (a distinction made in God's word by the way, but not in Mr. Newman's sense of it,) "we above applied the words, 'We have a little sister, and she has no breasts: but behold the little sister is grown up, and she still has no breasts, for *she is a man!*" so singular an interpretation of Scripture, and a psychological and physiological phenomenon so original and remarkable, may safely be left without any comment.—Such flowers as these we have hurriedly culled from the work before us. Many more of similar quality—all, it must be admitted, steeped in an atmosphere of philosophy, and breathing forth classic odours,—will be found profusely blooming in this theological garden.

It may be alleged, that as Mr. Newman is evidently a disbeliever in an

Eternal Hell, and in Eternal Torments,—as witness the language employed by him in his chapter, entitled "Hopes concerning Future life,"—he must be a favourite of ours, and that we must be ready to avail ourselves of his authority. That he has said a few things on the subject worth reflecting on, see particularly note p. 232, is certainly our conviction. But his advocacy in this matter we unhesitatingly repudiate. *Non tali auxilio!* Hands like his unhallowed by faith have no right to touch the gospel ark. Our Universalism is founded on divine revelation alone, and scorns to receive aid from any other quarter. We believe that Jesus, *the living God, is the Saviour* generally *of all men*, and *specially of them that believe*, simply, because we find the fact so expressed in the Scripture record. Human arguments in favour of the doctrine, such, for instance, as those of John Foster, nay, even the suggestions of our author, may, like what are denominated *the external evidences of Christianity*, serve from time to time *negatively* to refute, or, if not, to silence an antagonist. Divine and therefore *positive* conviction of divine truth in general, and of any divine truth in particular, is, however, absolutely impossible for any such human, and therefore merely *negative* arguments to produce. Our faith in the ultimate salvation of the now unregenerate, through the application to them, *καιρῳ ἰδιῳ*, of that *blood of Christ* which alone *cleanseth from all sin;* and of the resurrection-power of Christ to make them new creatures,—*ζωῆς τῆς μελλούσης*, as distinguished from the *ζωῆς τῆς νυν*, *the second*, as distinguished from *the first resurrection*,—like faith in the present and previous salvation of the Church, rests on the inspired testimony of God alone.—See 1 Tim. ii. 4, 6, (Greek,) iv. 9, 10, (Greek,) Rom. v. 12, *downwards*, 1 Cor. xv. 22, &c &c. Away then with the idea that Mr. Newman, much as we admire his talents and respect his natural integrity, should be received by us as a coadjutor in this glorious cause. Creature authority of all kinds, in matters of religion, we reject. Above all, the authority of one to whom Scripture is a fable, and a future life little better than a dream.

Some may fancy that we have not given the author sufficient credit for the place which he assigns to the emotions in his theory, and the influence which he represents them as exercising over the will. Above all, that we have overlooked the training which he insists on, as so indispensable to the due development of the active powers of man. God forbid that we should in any respect, even inadvertently, detract from the author's merits. His first chapter contains many admirable, mixed up with many questionable remarks on the subject of the human emotions, and suggests much that is excellent as to their proper training and cultivation. The influence of the affections on the will he shews himself to have carefully, and in some respects successfully studied. Admitting all this most cheerfully, what, however, is gained by Mr. Newman? Passing over other fundamental errors of his theory, evinced in the objects aimed at by him on his training of his emotions, what if the will itself be the grand seat of that disease, which, by what he conceives to be a proper treatment of the affective part of human nature, our author professes to be able to cure? No physician, worthy of the name, contents himself with attacking mere secondary symptoms, leaving all the while the main malady itself untouched. And yet this is the very thing which our mental physician, the author, does. So ignorant is he of the real facts of the case, that he knows not the heart—the will, or mind itself—to be *deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked*. With him, the heart or will is a latent principle of good, merely requiring to be freed from an abnormal load of vicious inclinations and affections, in order to be able to assert its divine freedom, and develop its pure and holy character. According to Scripture, and according to fact, the heart or will is *enmity against God, not subject to his law, nor indeed able to be so;* and, when suitable opportunities are afforded, uniformly manifests, that *its thoughts and imaginations are evil only, and that continually*. In this very heart or will, then, lies seated the evil—the disease—which is to be cured. And yet the existence of a diseased will is by our author denied. His scheme,

thus, is equivalent to a proposal to restrain or remove subordinate evils, IN ORDER TO GIVE THE GRAND AND MASTER EVIL THE FULLEST OPPORTUNITY TO DEVELOP ITSELF! What advantage then, except as to external morals—and even that is questionable—is gained by conceding to our author, that he takes a somewhat correct view of the importance of the emotions as a part of human nature; and that he furnishes some valuable hints as to the proper method of educating and controlling them? Supposing his training so far successful, and the emotions to a certain degree subdued, the will is merely thereby enabled, as the subsequent part of his work most fearfully and painfully evinces, to run riot in all the self-righteousness of Pharisaism, and to delude itself with the idea that it has been gradually getting rid of sin, while it has been in reality heaping up to itself sin to a most tremendous amount, by making use of its own fancied righteousness, as a battery by which to assail the revealed righteousness of God!—Notwithstanding, to the full benefit of all that he has correctly said respecting the affections and emotions, our author is fairly entitled. *Valeat quantum.*

Our author himself may try to neutralize, if not even subvert our reasonings, by telling us, somewhat in the form of the *argumentum ad misericordiam*, that "there is no book in the world which I love and esteem so much as the New Testament, with the devotional parts of the Old. There is none which I know so intimately, the very words of which dwell so close to me in my most sacred thoughts, none for which I so thank God, none on which my soul and heart have been to so great an extent moulded. In my early boyhood it was my private delight, and early companion, and to it I owe the best part of whatever wisdom there is in my manhood."—pp. 241, 242. Softly, Mr. Newman. Such words, when looked at in connection with the nature, statements, and whole scope of your work, avail nothing. Your *sympathies* with the New Testament are not denied, any more than is the representation of similar feelings having been experienced by himself, which we encounter in Mr. Froude's "Nemesis of Faith." Brought up as you both have been, it would be surprising, indeed, if such feelings did not exist. But what have fleshly feelings to do with the matter? It is not with the *poetry*, but with the *truth* of Scripture that we are now concerned. You are acquainted with Rousseau's *Emile*. You have no doubt perused, and been delighted with that magnificent and elegant elogium of his on the character of Christ, as given in the writings of the Evangelists, which constitutes by far the finest passage in his confession of the *Curé Savoyard*. Who, however, for all this fine burst of feeling—this apparently correct appreciation of the superiority of the Son of God, to the son of Sophroniscus—hesitates for a moment to regard and stigmatize Rousseau as an infidel? Sapping the foundations of Christianity as he does—preferring what he considers and calls the religion of nature, to that revelation of himself which God hath made in his own word—what lover of the Bible cares one straw for his insidious compliments? And are we to judge you, Sir, after a different fashion? Because, forsooth, you have never yet been able to shake off entirely those feelings of reverence for the Scriptures which in early life you imbibed, are we therefore to regard you as intending to honour a book, which, regarded as "a source of inspiration" (rather, *sole medium of spiritual illumination*,) you avowedly condemn as productive of "the deepest spiritual mischief?"—"There is no book in all the world, which I love and esteem so much as the New Testament." Pray, what is the worth of all this, when every doctrine of the New Testament is by you assailed, and undisguised and unmitigated contempt is by you poured upon its morals? Who cares for your feelings, or your hollow compliments, after your having trampled the doctrine of mediation under foot, treated that *blood of the Covenant* whereby any *are sanctified* as *an unholy thing, and done despite to the Spirit of grace?* What confidence can be reposed in the professions of respect for the Scriptures made by him, who assuming the purity of the human heart or will, hath thereby denied that *out of it,—from within*, and not from *without—proceed evil thoughts*, and all that is vile, Mark vii. 21—hath represented the divine righteousness of Christ, revealed as the

sinner's only hope, to be a dream—and virtually, if not expressly charged with imposture, *that life and immortality* which *have been brought to life by the gospel?* For shame, Sir! Assail Christianity and its doctrines as much as you please. Prefer to it some modern edition of the Stoical Philosophy, or some system ratified for the passing day by the suffrages of German rationalists and metaphysicians. Strong in its own divine origin and character, the religion of Jesus Christ can afford to laugh at all such puny and paltry attacks. But, O, after representing the statements and reasonings of Scripture as contemptible, and its morals as detestable, spare it your loathsome, we will not say your hypocritical* praise. If not for its sake, *at all events for your own.*†

But it is high time to bring this long and necessary, although we fear, to many of our readers, tedious article to a close. Were we to take up and consider every point in which we happen either to agree or disagree with our author, we should never have done. His book is a curious admixture of truth and error: the main basis false, and yet truths so prominent and striking, and so thoroughly entering into the texture of his theory, being connected with it, that the process of separating the true from the false requires almost as much care and delicacy as were exhibited by brother Martin, in dealing with the tags and appendages of his father's coat.‡ However, in spite of the temptations presented to us, we shall not allow ourselves to be betrayed into any more minute criticism.

Speaking generally, we cannot part with our author till we have,

First, given him a hint as to the style of his work. Considering the *negative* character of his whole system, it is by far too dogmatic in its tone and spirit. To some, this may prove a recommendation. In the apprehension of such, it may be the genuine expression of honesty, as indicating the author's confidence in the truth of his own theory. The full benefit of the suggestion, by all means let him reap. Still, in his case, if consistency is to be looked at, dogmatism is unwarranted. An author whose premises are open to dispute even on human principles, the only ones to which he appeals for their vindication—whose singular *recipe* for cleansing the conscience from a sense of guilt, is likely to be rejected by some religionists of his own stamp as too bold, and by others as making too much of moral evil—whose restriction of sin to the body and bodily affections, is likely to be stigmatized as Oriental, and regarded as worthless, by that profounder class of European freethinkers, who find it to be incapable of solving all moral phenomena—and whose disposition to rest satisfied with annihilation as the reward of his matchless excellence—should such be the divine will—must grate dreadfully on the prejudices of Unitarian supporters of the natural immortality of the human soul, and clash with their

---

* We mean not, in so expressing ourselves, to retract one word of what we have already said respecting the *natural* honesty of character, apparent even on the surface of Mr. Newman's work. *Natural* honesty, however, being merely a human and negative principle, we never allow ourselves to confound with that spiritual and positive honesty, which springs only from the knowledge and love of the truth. *That which is born of flesh, is flesh; and that which is born of Spirit, is spirit*, says the faithful and true witness, in John iii. 6. So say we. From the *negative* principles of human nature we never expect consequences to flow, which can only have their origin in the *positive* principles of the divine nature. James iii. 11, 12, may be consulted. Unconsciously even to himself, a man whose honesty, however great, is but fleshly, will be liable to have his mind and affections warped; and will, under the influence of circumstances, be found deviating from the strict line of integrity. See the two opposite kinds of honesty exemplified in Saul of Tarsus, before (Acts xxvi. 9) and after (Rom. ix. 1, 2 Tim. iv. 6—8) his conversion. See also our Lord's attestation to the fact of *natural* honesty existing even in these, by whom his cause was to be hated and opposed, and his disciples persecuted, in John xvi. 2. Such as have, in the light of Scripture and with the assistance furnished by the doctrine of *divine inversion*, studied and understood the character of David Hume and Percy Bysshe Shelley, will experience no difficulty in comprehending, how a man naturally possessed of the most amiable, upright, and honorable dispositions, may, in no small degree if not altogether, where Christianity is concerned, be pursuing a line of conduct diametrically opposed to them.

† Will Mr. Newman venture to take shelter under the *dictum* of our friend, George Gilfillan, who, speaking of the late John Sterling, says, "Attracted ever more and more by the learning and genius of Germany, his orthodox belief of Christianity was shattered, *though his childlike love for it remained the same?*"—"Second Gallery of Portraits," p. 415. The sentence is prettily rounded. But does it express a *fact?*

‡ Swift's "Tale of a Tub."

notions of the rights of virtue—should *certes*, have been a *little* more sparing in his condemnation of those whom he is pleased, in common with a large and and growing tribe of modern writers, to style *Bibliolaters*, and in his assertion of the truth of his own philosophical and theological *nostrums*. Several sneers at the fallacy and presumption of others, issuing from one whose system, as merely human, is necessarily and entirely fallible, and in whom the exhibition of anything like confidence and certainty is the highest presumption, might with propriety and consistency have been omitted. However, for aught we know, what in our eyes is inconsistency and in somewhat bad taste, may have been adopted of set purpose. So close and accurate an observer as Mr. Newman, while revolted at, and disgusted by the authoritative style of the sacred writers, as perfectly inconsistent with his darling liberty of the human will, may nevertheless have been struck with the influence exercised by the assumption of authority, even by mere human beings, over the majority of mankind. His classic lore had made him acquainted with the success of Numa Pompilius in pretending to converse with the Nymph Egeria, as well as with a multitude of similar cases. The Church of Rome, besides, he could not fail to remark, owes no small share of its power to its bold and blasphemous assumption of the divine attribute of infallibility, and to constant mimicking of the style of him, *who spake as having authority, and not as the scribes*. Matt. vii. 29. *If any one deny this, let him be anathema*, closing every decree of the Council of Trent—although emanating, if Father Paul Sarpi is to be believed, from a set of not over-reputable, and over-Christian Church dignitaries—is language which, from the slavish nature of the unregenerate human mind, will be found to carry great weight with many. Is the knowledge of such facts, and a great desire to turn the artillery of authoritative declarations against the Scriptures, the secret of Mr. Newman's dogmatism? In some others, we might have believed this. There is, however, on the part of our author, too much dignity, seriousness and earnestness of purpose, as well as integrity, to allow us to think that having throughout his book protested against authority, as inconsistent with the freedom of the human will, he should in his own case, and for any purpose, intentionally have had recourse to it. He must have been betrayed unconsciously into the use of the decisive and peremptory language which he so frequently employs, by a zealous although indiscriminating desire to promote the interests of his cause. Should we be right in this conjecture, and the style objected to have been inadvertently adopted, we would, with reference to any future writings of his on religious subjects, respectfully remind Mr. Newman of the purer models of the School to which he belongs, such as "the Dialogues of Plato," the "Tusculan Questions," "Bayle's Dictionary," and the works of David Hume; and would recommend the uniform employment of the language of doubt and modest scepticism to one, who, on his own shewing, has only his own fallible light and reasonings to trust to, and, embarked in his frail vessel, is sailing towards a port of which he knows nothing himself, and can convey no information whatever to others.

Secondly, we are far from wishing to assert or insinuate, that Mr. Newman, in the sentiments which he holds, develops and enforces, "stands alone in his glory." The position he has taken up is one which he occupies and defends in concert with a host of compeers. With the Froudes, the Foxtons, and others of the same stamp, he is making common cause. True, in certain minor respects, he and his associates differ; but an overweening regard to the private and personal light of nature, a preference to self-guidance, a hatred of authoritative revelation, a contempt for Old Testament if not even for all Scriptural morality, and a disposition to misrepresent, disparage, mystify and even do away with miracles,—a disposition reaching so far with some of them as to lead to the pronouncing of miraculous interposition *an impossibility*—are features common to them all. Nor is an assault on the fundamental principles of Christianity confined to them. German rationalists, deriving their hints from one greater than themselves, the notorious Spinoza, have pointed out the track in which they glory to follow. Nay, in their elevation of human will to a sort of

independent throne, and in their more covert or more open assault upon the alone free will of Jehovah, they have had men, whom the great majority of the religious world is pleased to account evangelical, as their precursors and associates. Wesleyan Methodists and many so called pious churchmen in this country, together with Tholuck and others who would fain pass for evangelical on the continent, not content with maintaining that sin is alone and exclusively chargeable on the creature, and that as exhibiting opposition to God and his attributes, it is the fitting subject of punishment,—which is unquestionably true,—would fain assign to the creature, in the introduction and commission of sin, something like entire independence of the Creator. Nothing will satisfy these parties, but such a modified Manicheeism, as by exalting human free will, and depressing divine sovereignty—as by extending the province of the former and limiting that of the latter—shall withdraw the realm of sin from the absolute control of him, by whom all things exist, and to whom all things are subject; and thereby shall raise the author of sin, and sin itself, to something like a footing of equalitywith the Creator and his attributes.—If this assertion of ours be denied, then what mean the sneers of Wesley, Tholuck, Morrison, and a host of coadjutors, at the doctrine of God being the source and doer of all things—the doctrine of the absolute and unlimited sovereignty of Jehovah so broadly and unequivocally laid down by the Holy Ghost, in the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Romans? All, it is there, as well as elsewhere asserted, happens according to the divine purpose and decree: if otherwise, then upon the independent acts of the Spirit of Evil, God's decree must in part at least be founded; and by the processes of the prince of darkness, must the doings of the God of light and love be to a certain extent regulated! If all things be not dependent on the purpose and plan of the Creator, then, in some respects, upon the actions of his own creatures must the Creator be forced to depend! Are all the deluded men who have unawarily admitted the premises which we impugn, prepared likewise to adopt the inevitable conclusion? If not, and yet if by the premises they are still determined to abide, by what known process of argument can they, assuming creature independence in any respect whatever, reconcile it with the alone, perfect, exclusive, absolute, infinite independence of the Creator? Ignorant of the fact although they may be, atheistical is the principle into the admission and support of which so many professing Christians have been betrayed. Glad are we, that warnings of the unscriptural and mischievous nature of such theories have not been awanting. Passing by what Luther, Calvin, Elisha Cole, and others at a former period have written, in exposure of the delusion, let us refer to something more modern. In Scotland, John Barclay, (certainly not in terms the spirit of which we can approve,) lifted up his warning voice, in his usual powerful and conclusive manner, against an insidious attempt to disjoin the entrance and reign of sin from the divine decree, in his controversy with MacRae. Admirably, likewise, about two or three years ago, was the awfully unscriptural character of German evangelism, after having been eulogized and fraternized with by the leaders of the Free Kirk, denounced and laid bare in the pages of "McPhail." And delighted are we to find that Bailey, in his recent splendid poem, "the Angel World," has brought the powers of his mighty genius to bear against the devilish theory of human free will, and its inevitable consequence, the setting of it up in opposition to the alone and true free will of God:—

> These after mingling, as by chance or choice,
> In holy celebrations, when first asked
> Their rank to name, and order, made reply,
> They were the youngest offspring of the Heavens,
> Children of bliss and knowledge, richly dowered,
> With singular joys, and rare immunities:—
> That they *were spirits of freedom, and their suit*
> *And servage voluntary, whence alone*
> *Budded what little merit they possessed;*
> *As otherwise, their gracious Lord, they said,*
> *Were mocked with forced compliance; that all good*
> *Sprang from the natural impulse of their souls,*
> *And the proud pleasure of pure liberty.*

That they the measure of the skies fulfilled,
The complements of all extremes of light:
Of all celestial essence they the sum,
*And after them was nothing.**

The fact is, in vain is it to assail and lop off some stray branches of the infidel and atheistic system, while the very root and trunk of the mischief are nourished and fostered by our would-be evangelicals, as if they constituted the truth of God. A Froude, in his "Nemesis of Faith," and a Newman in his "Soul, its Sorrows and Aspirations," are merely pushing out to their legitimate consequences, concessions made by ignorant or hypocritical professors of Christianity. The alone sovereignty of God—the subjection of all persons and and things to the divine control, and the subserviency of even evil itself to the divine purpose and decree—are fundamental truths of the Sacred Record. They furnish the key to the understanding of the divine character, as revealed in Christ Jesus. While with these doctrines, a shadowy and subordinate freedom of will, on the part of man, as having been *made in the divine image*, (made *like* God, not *one* with God, for this would be to identify the creature with the Creator,) is perfectly consistent, and constitutes the foundation of man's responsibility, and liability to punishment; on the other hand, a freedom of will which would imply, that man's will is in any respect independent of man's nature, and independent of man's Creator, is the very acmé at once of absurdity and blasphemy. Let not, then, the religious and professedly Christian supporters of the absolute and independent freedom of man's will, pretend to attack Mr. Newman, and assist us. Their help we indignantly disclaim. Participators with Mr. Newman in the foundation principle of his assault on the revealed character of God, and thereby abettors of his sin, we charge them with being. Him they have supplied with the premises, which his own acute, elegant, logical and philosophic mind has carried out to their legitimate and inevitable conclusions. The Lord lead the deluded professors of a spurious evangelism to review the grounds which they themselves have taken up. Rather, led to that blood of sprinkling which alone cleanseth from all sin, and made new in the spirit of their minds by the resurrection power of Christ, may they as set free by the Son of man, and given to experience what true gospel liberty is, reject with abhorrence that treacherous and delusive freedom, but real slavery, on which formerly they prided themselves, and of which they made their boast.

Thirdly, as notwithstanding our opposition to, indeed abhorrence of Mr. Newman's leading sentiments, in consequence of their being diametrically opposed to God's revelation of himself, and subversive of the hopes of guilty man, our feelings towards the author himself are kind and we are desirous to part on friendly terms with him, we would wind up this long article with two quotations from his work, both of them interesting, and both of them likely to obtain the concurrence and command the approbation of our readers.

Our first quotation respects the nature of the motives which dissuade from crime, and of those which are best calculated to impart consolation to the human mind. Amidst much that is questionable, if not even false, our anthor says truly, p. 231:—"Guilt was restrained only by temporal inflictions:" among the Jews, he means:† "and among ourselves also, beyond a doubt, crime is repressed in bold and wicked men, only by fear of the visible and present judge. Whether hell be in theory believed or disbelieved, it has no practical power, except over the less hardened. But the attempt to turn Religion into a system of State Police, is an impiety which inevitably defeats its own end.‡ Nor less does it desecrate divine Hope, to apply it as a means of softening the sorrows of the unspiritual." Mr. Newman using the term *unspiritual* in a different sense from that in which we employ it; and yet his

* "The Angel World," by P. J. Bailey. p. 12.
† An idea derived, we suspect, from Warburton's "Divine Legation of Moses."
‡ See "Divine Inversion," p. 111, near top.

remark not being the less true on that account.—"Natural sympathy is far more effective for consolation, than any of those conventional topics, poured forth professionally on an uncongenial mind. If Hope is to comfort men in their darker, it must live with them in their brighter hours; it must gush up out of an inward fountain."—True; understanding by this *the hope of the gospel*, inspired by the knowledge and belief of the truth. John iv. 14.—"I know it is said, that the poor are made more patient by the notion so current among them, that in another life they will get compensation for the hardships which they endure in the present: but this is to buy patience by propagating delusion."

And our second, which likewise is not altogether untinctured with error, may be fitly pondered on by those whom it concerns:—"Its action," that is, the action of what Mr. Newman denominates the *living word of God*, "is directly upon the conscience and upon the soul; and hence its wonderful results; not on the critical faculties, upon which the Spirit is powerless." * This must be received with an explanation. The Spirit, by the truth, does *enlighten the eyes of our understandings*, and does enable thereby to discriminate *between soul and spirit*.—"Such at least was Paul's weapon for fighting the Lord's battles.—But when the modern battle commences, what do we see? A study-table spread over with books in various languages; a learned man dealing with literary and historical questions; referring to Tacitus and Pliny; engaged in establishing that Josephus is a credible, and not a credulous writer; inquiring whether the Greek of the Apocalypse and of the fourth gospel can have come from the same hand: searching through Justin Martyr and Irenæus, in order to find out whether the gospels are a growth by accretion and modification, or were originally struck off as we now read them; comparing Philo or Plotinus with John and Paul; in short we find him engaged, (with much or little success) in praiseworthy efforts at Local History, Criticism of Texts, History of Philosophy, Logic, (or the Theory of Evidence,) Physiology, Demonology, and other important but very difficult studies; all unappreciable to the unlearned, all remote from the sphere in which the soul operates. And are these abstruse arguments the powerful and living Word of God? Is it not extravagant to call inquiries of this sort 'spiritual,' or to expect spiritual results from them? When the spiritual man (as such) cannot judge, the question is removed into a totally different court from that of the Soul, the court of the Critical Understanding.'—"The question is one of external evidence. How then can the state of the Soul be tested by the conclusion to which the Intellect is led? What means the anathematizing those who remain unconvinced? And how can it be imagined that the Lord of the Soul cares more about a Historical, than about a Geological, a Metaphysical, or a Mathematical argument? The processes of thought have nothing to quicken the conscience or affect the soul." Some caution is required, in regard to the reception of this in the unqualified manner in which it is laid down. "More words are not wanted to show the intense opposition of all this to the Gospel as conceived of by St. Paul." pp. 244—246.—"Theology, one might have thought, was the science of God; but no, it is the science of Biblical Interpretation, and Historical Criticism."—"And yet these are topics in which a man might obtain high ecclesiastical renown, though his conscience were seared, and his soul utterly paralyzed. Though by courtesy called spiritual, the knowledge is simply secular; and an immediate result of it is, that *youth*, however unspiritual, if only the logical and critical faculties have been developed, steps into the chair of the Christian teacher, and becomes ecclesiatically higher than *age* however spiritually exercised. Christianity has been turned into a LITERATURE, and therefore her teachers necessarily become a LITERARY PROFESSION." p. 247.†

D. T.

* See "Divine Inversion," p. 113 note, pp. 242—244, and pp. 252—256.

† In re-perusing this, we are irresistibly impelled to think of Dr. Davidson's very able "Introduction to the New Testament," and of the *excessive* laudation of it, as well as of the

THE SCRIPTURES TURNED UPSIDE DOWN BY MODERN LIMITARIANS.

THERE are above one hundred passages in the Old Testament, and more than one thousand in the New, which in reality are *inexplicable* in any other view than that of *Universal Salvation.*

Most of these passages have been, and are being turned upside down by those who *limit* the goodness, mercy, justice, and love of God, to a *part* of the human family. One thing however is as true as the word of God, which is this, "*God is love,*" and his goodness being infinite, eternal, and unchangeable, must extend to *every* creature that he hath made.

A few of the passages in the Scriptures, which are mystified, perverted, or turned upside down, by doctrines of the wise and prudent of this generation, shall here be brought forward in the face of these doctrines.

TRUTH.	PERVERSION.
Luke ii. 10.—Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to *all* people. For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, *a Saviour*, who is Christ the Lord.	Luke ii. 10.—Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to *some* people. For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, Christ the Lord, "officially" a Saviour of *all*, but "efficaciously" the Saviour of those only who believe and are willing to be saved.
John xii. 32.—And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw *all* men unto me. Note.—As surely as these words are truth, all men *shall* be drawn unto Jesus Christ.	John xii. 32.—And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will give all men who hear the word an opportunity to come to me.

---

principles on which it is founded, that appears in the "Eclectic Review," for February. One might almost fancy, did we not know the priority of Mr. Newman's appearance, that the critic in the "Eclectic" had furnished our author with his text, and had sat to him for his picture. With the critic, the science of Biblical Hermeneutics is everything. By means of theological literature and researches, religion is to be purified and spiritualized; and Christianity itself, *hitherto in great danger*, (!) is to be rescued from the clutches of German rationalists and sceptics. A literary clergy are to secure us from the otherwise irresistible onslaughts of infidelity. "In a well-taught ministry we rest our confidence of the safety, not of nonconformity alone, but of Protestantism; or, rather, of 'pure and undefiled religion.'"—*Eclectic Review. Feb.* 1850. p. 190. Bravo! Mr. Editor. So *the Wonderful—the Counsellor—the everlasting Father—the Prince of Peace*,—on whose shoulders, according to ancient prophecy, the government and safety of his church were made originally to rest, has seen meet to transfer them to those of weak, fallible and dying creatures! Salvation is no longer through the shed blood, and resurrection of Christ Jesus—no longer through the purpose and power of him *who is mighty to save*—but through *the exertion of man's own intellect!* Such *totidem verbis* is your own assertion:—"The intellect of the world has been awakened, and it shall be saved only through the medium of the mastery of its intellect." *Ut supra.* Pray, Sir, did you ever hear of the Lord Jesus, when addressing Peter, having declared, "On this rock," Peter's good Confession, or rather the subject matter of that Confession, (see Granville Penn's remarks on the passage, in his Annotations of the New Covenant,) "I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it."? When was this declaration abrogated? When, from *the true foundation* other than which *no man can lay, even Christ Jesus*, was the Church,—like one of those buildings in New-York, which can be removed from its original *locate* by means of machinery, and stationed elsewhere,—by God himself taken, and made to depend for its stability, if not even for its very existence, on Dr. Tholuck's intellect, Dr. Davidson's learning and research, and Dr. Hamilton's eloquence? Disgraceful, Sir. You profess to be *evangelical* and the conductor of an *evangelical magazine*, and yet can sport sentiments which no true and simple-hearted believer in *the truth as it is in Jesus*, can hear, except with feelings of astonishment and indignation. Learn, and let your besotted readers and admirers learn, that the leviathan which in times past has foiled human intellect, and laughed human learning to scorn,—which holds in perfect contempt *the shaking of the spears* of your redoubtable armies of book-taught and literary giants—has quailed and fled before an *It is written*, when uttered by the lips of the Son of God; and by this same weapon alone,—simple, but of glorious and divine temper,—wielded not by human intellect or an arm of flesh, but by faith, is the monster destined to be finally overthrown and destroyed.

TRUTH.	PERVERSION.
Rom. v. 10.—For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.	Rom. v. 10.—For if, when we were enemies, God gave us an opportunity of *reconciling* ourselves to him by the death of his Son, much more shall we who believe *save* ourselves by his life.
Rom. v. 18.—Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came upon *all* men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon *all* men to justification of life.	Rom. v. 18.—Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon *some* men, and is *offered* unto *all* who hear the gospel.
Rom. v. 19.—For as by one man's disobedience *the many* were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall *the many* be made righteous.	Rom. v. 19.—For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall *some* be made righteous.
20. Moreover the law entered that the offence might abound; but where sin abounded grace *did* much more abound.	20.—Moreover the law entered that the offence might have an opportunity to abound; but where sin abounded, grace *may* much more abound.
21. That *as* sin hath reigned unto death, even *so* might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.	21.—That as sin hath reigned unto the death of all the children of the first Adam; even so *might* (not *must*) grace reign through righteousness to eternal life, in all who become the children of the second Adam by *believing*.
Rom. xi. 32.—For God hath concluded all [Jews and Gentiles] in unbelief, that he might have mercy on all; (for he is no respector of persons.)	Rom. xi. 32.—For God hath concluded *all* in unbelief, that he might have mercy on all who *become penitent* before they die; and consign to endless torment all who die in impenitence.
1 Cor. xv. 22.—For *as* in Adam *all* die, *even so* in Christ shall all be made alive.	1 Cor. xv. 22.—For as in Adam *all* die, even so in Christ shall *all* be raised to eternal *existence*, and those who are *Christ's at his coming*, to eternal life.
Heb. ix. 26.—Once, in the end of the world, hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.	Heb. ix. 26. &c.—Once, in the end of the world, hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself; but being overcome by the "incorrigible" resistance of his creatures, he is "shut up to substitute damnation instead of salvation;" and, in wicked men and devils, perpetuate and continue eternally *sin*, that thing he abhorred and came to put away: so that the grace of God is frustrated, and myriads of the enemies of God made eternally and unchangeably wicked — standing as indestructible monuments of the victory of the creature over the Creator—and a never-ending evidence of the impotence of Jesus, in coming and *beginning* to do what he was not able to finish.
Dan. ix. 24.—Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to *finish* the transgression, and to make an *end* of *sin*, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, &c.	
1 Cor. xv. 26.—The *last* enemy shall be destroyed—death.	
Matt. xix. 26.—With God *all* things are *possible*.	
Matt. xxviii. 18.—*All* power is given unto me in heaven and on earth.	
Luke xix. 10.—For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which is lost.	
John iii. 17.—God sent his Son that the *world* through him might be saved.	
John xvii. 4.—I have *finished* the work which thou gavest me to do.	
1 John iii. 8.—For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.	

Truth.	Perversion.
Gal. iii. 8.—God before preached the gospel to Abraham saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.	Gal. iii. 8, &c.—God before preached the gospel to Abraham, saying, In thee shall *some* individuals of every nation be blessed; but every individual of every nation shall neither be blessed in him nor call him blessed; for myriads of those in all nations dying in unbelief and impenitence, shall "roar, curse and blaspheme God in a lake of fire burning with brimstone to all eternity." *Old* things, wicked men and devils, shall not pass away; but shall be made immortally wicked as they were of old, and to them shall be more death, more pain, more sorrow, weeping, wailing and gnashing of teeth, an eternal existence in torment, and when hills, rocks and mountains are *no more*, they shall "call on them to fall on them and cover them from the face of their Judge."
Rev. v. 13.—And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, unto him that sitteth upon the throne, even the Lamb, for ever and ever.	
Rev. xxi. 3.—And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them. And God shall wipe away *all* tears from their eyes; and there shall be *no more* death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be *any more* pain; for the former things are *passed away*. And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make *all things new*. These words are true and faithful.	

The foregoing passages shall suffice for the present, as a sample of the true sayings of God turned upside down by the winds of modern doctrine.

It is indeed pitiable to see, in the published volumes of men of master minds, so much labour put forth in twisting a meaning out of the plain and simple passages of the word of Jehovah, that may seem to favour their notions of a limited salvation, endless sin and sufferings, and an eternal and unchangeable devil and hell.

If one happens to say that the Scriptures do, as harmoniously, plainly, and assuredly testify, that all men dead and living, born and unborn, are already reconciled to God and *saved* by the work and resurrection of Jesus Christ alone, as that they were *lost* by the offence of Adam, many of these learned and pious men get into as great a passion as Jonah did, when he found that God was about to save all the men, women, children, and cattle in Nineveh. They cry out "A God *all mercy* is a God *unjust*." The do not however find fault with God for saving Nineveh. No, "*They repented*." But to suppose that God will pardon and save those who die contradicting and blaspheming the gospel is an out and out perversion of what *they* call *the* gospel, or way of salvation.

From love to these men and love to the truth, let it be said, that these preachers of The Perversion know not the gospel that Paul proclaimed. One would think they had never read the eleventh chapter of Romans, particularly ver. 6. Nothing will please them but a limited and *conditional* salvation. They speak swelling words of universal atonement,—a free, full, and finished salvation, &c., but then it turns out that in reality it is not *finished*, till the sinner do *something* which every sinner is supposed to be *able* to do, in order to render himself *acceptable* in the sight of God, through Christ Jesus. We hear ever and again of what the sinner has to *do;* but precious little of what Christ *has done*.

But God was well pleased for his righteousness' sake *alone*, and those who are not pleased with *what pleaseth God*, are in danger of lying down in sorrow, in a short and narrow bed, compassed about with sparks of their own kindling.

ANETAZΩ.

EXTRACT FROM THE LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE OF THE REV. JOHN FOSTER.

Notwithstanding the length of our Extract from Sir J. Stephen's Essays, in our first number, and from Foster's Life and Correspondence in our second, we are induced to make another from the latter as further showing the gloomy and embarassing reflections excited by the popular doctrine in superior and pious minds. Mr. Foster derives some consolation from his disbelief of it; but that is all.—Strange, that after the lapse of so many centuries, the word of God should be so little understood!—But professing Christians, like the Jews, "have made it of no effect by their traditions." This is the cause: and, knowing this, our direct course is, in the first place, to cast them all away; and, in the second, to employ, under God, the means which he affords us to arrive at its true interpretation.

Letter ccxxvii. To the Rev. Dr. Harris. On Missions.

"There is one other topic on which I should be tempted into an emphatic language, if I had not a difficulty to express exactly, discreetly, perhaps intelligibly, what I wish to convey. I allude to the light in which the Almighty is presented in much of what is spoken and written in the missionary service. I confess I have been confounded at what I have heard or read. For it seems to me to represent the Maker and Sovereign of the world as acting on a plan of exceedingly limited interference in the moral condition and destiny of the human race,—almost as acting in a subordinate or secondary capacity to the human instruments he employs, or *unsuccessfully* calls upon to be employed.

"The idea forcibly suggested is, that, calmly keeping his power in abeyance, he devolves on a certain portion of men a real practical responsibility for the salvation or perdition of undefined multitudes of their race; making his own will on that awful alternative, conditional on the choice and conduct of these responsible persons. Certain things conferred on the fallen race would be an infinite blessing; they *may* be conferred, for He is willing; but whether they *shall* be conferred, depends on another will—the will of that same section of the race to do their duty to the rest. As if he should be supposed to say, "If you will zealously labour for their salvation, I will save them, otherwise not. They may be saved if you choose; it is more your concern than mine." A tribe or nation of eastern pagans has perished, through successive generations; there has been in the church in this western world a moral power, and therefore duty, to secure, in some important measure, the contrary event; the decision was placed in the hands of the depositaries of that power; but they were destitute of Christian philanthropy, and they decided fatally for the poor pagans whose destiny was depending on them. Thus the final state of a portion, perhaps a large portion, of the human race, has been, *immediately*, less at the disposal of the sovereign Maker, than of a certain order of human beings, who might have effected their salvation if they would. Multitudes of pagans are perishing at this hour, actually because Christians in England are parsimonious of their exertions and their money. The sovereign Being is looking on, and leaving their future state dependent on this penurious and precarious resource. In one of the speeches not long since delivered in Bristol, the speaker supposed himself to be addressing some one (any one) individual; and said;—"By refusing at this time the contribution which you can afford, you may be consigning one soul, that otherwise might be saved, to endless perdition." A not unusual figure has been that of a miserable crowd approaching

the verge of a dreadful gulf. And the exclamation is, Oh, will you not eagerly and instantly hasten to throw yourselves between? What mortal cruelty to linger! The catastrophe is infallible if you do not rush to the rescue; for higher power declines to interpose. Lords of their destiny! look at the dread alternative you are deciding. At hearing such things who can keep out, or force out, of his mind the idea of a Deity resembling the gods of Epicurus?

"Sometimes, indeed, instead of what looks so like an attribution of indifference, a more gracious and sympathetic character is ascribed to the supreme power. He is earnestly intent on human salvation. "The heart of God" is deeply moved, he longs, he yearns for, he almost passionately desires, the conversion of heathens, of all mankind; he is, as it were, impatient to see his servants in zealous action; he pleads to them every motive that ought to arouse and actuate them; he reproaches their indolence; sets before them the mighty things which *cannot* be done till they shall go vigourously into the work; *his* operation being subjected to unwilling delay in waiting for theirs. And this is the almighty Being whose single volition could transform the whole race in a moment!

"Now my dear Sir, whatever be the *right* way of setting forth the subject, I do think that which I have attempted to describe borders very nearly (doubtless unconsciously and unthinkingly) on impiety. I need not be reminded that in the Scriptures there are many expressions, used in condescending accomodation, which might be cited as analogous to the strain of language against which I am protesting. Let those strongly figurative expressions stand out as illustrative of that condescension manifesting itself in such forms as men might not have presumed to utter. Let them be cited as what God has condescended to say. But to construct of similar figures our current language, which ought to be that of plain truth and fact, will be to establish a fallacious order of ideas, to which literal truth will come to be the exception.

"I hope, indeed may assume, that you are of a cheerful temperament; but are you not sometimes invaded by the darkest visions and reflexions while casting your view over the scene of human existence, from the beginning to this hour? To me it appears a most mysteriously awful economy, overspread by a lurid and dreadful shade. I pray for the piety to maintain a humble submission of thought and feeling to the wise and righteous Disposer of all existence. But to see a nature created in purity, qualified for perfect and endless felicity, but ruined at the very origin, by a disaster devolving fatally on all the race—to see it in an early age of the world estranged from truth, from the love and fear of its Creator, from that, therefore, without which existence is a thing to be deplored—abandoned to all evil, till swept away by a deluge—the renovated race revolting into idolatry and iniquity, and spreading downward through ages in darkness, wickedness, and misery—no Divine dispensation to enlighten and reclaim it, except for one small section, and that section itself a no less flagrant proof of the desperate corruption of the nature;—the ultimate, grand remedial visitation, Christianity, labouring in a difficult progress and very limited extension, and soon perverted from its purpose into darkness and superstition, for a period of a thousand years—at the present hour known and even nominally acknowledged by very greatly the minority of the race, the mighty mass remaining prostrate under the infernal dominion of which countless generations of their ancestors have been the slaves and victims—a deplorable majority of the people in the Christian nations strangers to the vital power of Christianity, and a large proportion directly hostile to it; and even the institutions pretended to be for its support and promotion, being baneful to its virtue—its progress in the work of conversion, in even the most favoured part of the world, *distanced* by the progressive increase of the population, so that, even there (but to a fearful extent if we take the world at large) the disproportion of the faithful to the irreligious is continually increasing—the sum of all these melancholy facts being, that thousands of millions have passed, and thousands every day are passing, out of the world, in no state of

fitness for a pure and happy state elsewhere. Oh, it is a most confounding and appalling contemplation!

"And it would be a transcendently direful one, if I believed the doctrine of the eternity of future misery. It amazes me to imagine how thoughtful and benevolent men, believing that doctrine, can endure the sight of the present world, and the history of the past. To behold successive innumerable crowds carried on in the mighty impulse of a depraved nature, which they are impotent to reverse, and to which it is not the will of God in his sovereignty to apply the only adequate power, the withholding of which consigns them inevitably to their doom—to see them passing through a short term of mortal existence (absurdly sometimes denominated a *probation*) under all the world's pernicious influences, with the addition of the malign and deadly one of the great tempter and destroyer, to confirm and augment the inherent depravity, on their speedy passage to everlasting wo,—I repeat, I am, without pretending to any extraordinary depth of feeling, amazed to conceive what they contrive to do with their sensibility, and in what manner they maintain a firm assurance of the Divine goodness and justice. Yet I see numbers of these good men preserving, apparently without any great effort, a tone of equanimity, sometimes excited to hilarity, while every where closely surrounded by creatures whom, as not being the subjects of divine grace, they deliberately regard as the destined victims of eternal fire; and must regard as if created on purpose, that by passing a few fleeting sinful moments here, they might be prepared for it.

I meet with a few intelligent and pious men who join in the disbelief; and suspect, that unavowedly, many others are repelled into strong doubt, at the least, by the infinite horror of the tenet.

"Here again I am reminded how the missionary advocates make of all this just a charge against the Church—the religious section, as having been in effect owing to *them*; as if they had a certain power and responsibility, and had it now, to reverse substantially this awful destiny. But the supreme Sovereign's scheme and economy for the race was formed in no dependence on what the more privileged section might attempt, or not attempt, for them; formed indeed in a perfect foresight of what would not be attempted How plain is it, that the case has its reason and its mystery in something far deeper than any consideration of what they might have done, and neglected to do. How self-evident the proposition, that if the sovereign Arbiter had INTENDED the salvation of the race, it must have been accomplished."

THE sacrificial lamb which bears the sin, also takes it away; there is no bearing of sin without removing the same. Tholuck was induced to make this distinction merely through observing that opponents attributed so much importance to the signification "*to take away.*" Their error, however, consists not in the application of this meaning, but in their ascribing the removal of sin to the *teaching*, not to the *sacrificial death* of the Lamb of God. Further, the signification "punishment" for ἁμαρτία in this passage certainly is not demonstrable. 1 John iii. 5 clearly shows, from the connexion, that αἴρειν τὰς ἁμαρτίας in John means to abolish, to remove sin itself. Hence we can only express the sense of our passage thus, by a periphrasis: "behold this is the sacrificial Lamb, prepared and given by God himself for this purpose, to bear the sin of the world, and by his sufferings and death to annul and remove it." Scripture knows nothing of an endurance of the penalty of sin on the part of the Saviour while men retain the sin itself; sin continuing would continually reproduce the penalty and thus the remission would be annulled.—*Olshausen on John* i. 29.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

DEAR SIR.—The following account of a meeting at Richmond, Surrey, may not be unacceptable to some of your readers; and if you think it worthy of insertion, it is at your service. Its origin was the dismissal of one of the agents of the London City Mission, employed at Richmond, and labouring acceptably among the poor. His mind began to doubt of the doctrine of endless punishment; and after a time, becoming convinced of its unscriptural character, he was too consciencious to conceal it; the result of which was his dismission. Various reports began to circulate, which he thought might be injurious to his Christian character; and in order to prevent this, and justify himself, he advertised his intention to state publicly the cause of his separation from the Society, with his reasons for rejecting the popular doctrine. The room, capable of containing about 350 persons, was filled; and many went away, unable to gain admission.

Mr. Henry Clark (the dismissed agent) addressed the meeting, and gave seven reasons for rejecting endless punishment; and seven for believing in the restitution of all things, as in Acts iii, 21. He was heard with much attention; and, though with some slight dissent from a few on some of his remarks, yet evidently with approbation from the majority; and I have good reason to believe, from what I have since heard, that the cause of Truth has been much advanced in that neighbourhood.

He gave the following reasons for rejecting the doctrine of endless punishment:—1. Because he found the original Greek words αιων, αιωνιος, translated in our version, *ever, everlasting*, &c., have a limited meaning in many passages; and he therefore could not depend on any unlimited application of them. And 2. Because they cannot be proved from Scripture to have an unlimited meaning. 3. Because the words *hell, fire*, &c. do not prove eternal torment, as they are taken from the Greek, "*Gehenna of fire*," and refer to the valley of Hinnom. 4. Because the words, *damned* and *damnation* do not prove eternal misery, as they are taken from the same Greek words as *judgment, judged, condemn, condemnation, condemned.* 5. Because the passage where the words *everlasting*, &c., occur in the New Testament refer to the coming of Christ, and not to what is considered the general judgment. 6. Because the words that occur in those passages, which refer to what is called the general judgment, are opposed to endless life in misery; and are stated to be death, such as Rev. xx. 14, 15, xxi. 8. 7. Because the revealed perfections of God, and his declared purposes in Creation and Redemption, are by this doctrine limited and perverted.

His reasons for receiving the doctrine of the restitution of all things were,—1. Because it is strictly in harmony with God's revealed perfections, and with many plain declarations of Scripture. 2. Because all mankind are his offspring. Acts xvii, 28. 3. Because there is to be a restitution of all things. Acts iii, 19, 20. 4. Because God has provided for the recovery and happiness of all. 5. Because sin and death are the works of Satan. 6. Because the Son of God is the destroyer of the works of the devil. 7. Because God declares they shall be destroyed.

I give you thus concisely his reasons; purposing in a future letter, to give you his Scripture references and arguments by which they are supported; and I think your readers, if unprejudiced, will find them sufficiently cogent to justify his conclusions.

Yours truly,

J. O.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

SIR,—Can you or any of your learned readers explain why the Greek word καταργειται is translated in 1 Cor. xv. 26, in the future tense "*shall be* destroyed;" and in 2 Cor. iii. 14, in the present tense, "*is done* away?"

See the Greek, also the English, of both passages. As far as I understand the grammatical construction of the verb, the latter text only gives the correct rendering; and, were the first translated properly, it would be given, "The last enemy death is destroyed," however much at variance that may be with our preconceived views of the subject.

Believing with you, that "there are indeed some words and phrases, the mistranslation of which is essentially injurious to the sense and consistency of Scripture," I venture to point out this as being as flagrant a one as any I have met with.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

Δ.

[The foregoing criticism is undoubtedly correct. The verb in both texts, has a present signification; as we hope to show at large on a future occasion. We are gratified by such enquiries, and shall answer them to the best of our ability. ED.]

THE UNIVERSALIST.

MAY, 1850.

ON THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST, AND THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

The principal passages relating to these events are, Matt. xxiv, xxv; Acts i. 11; Heb ix. —26—28; 1 Thess. iv. 13—17; and 1 Cor. xv. 12—57. According to traditional doctrine, they are yet future: doctrine, which, on examination, is found to be superficial, inconsistent, and untenable.

Matt. xxiv. xxv.

"When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the consummation of the age?" xxiv. 3.

The disciples put this question to our Lord after showing him the buildings of the temple, and hearing, in return, his declaration, that one stone should not be left on another which should not be thrown down. The destruction of the temple necessarily involved the end of the Jewish age, or dispensation; because the observance of the Mosaic ritual could then be no longer continued. The disciples also rightly connected this event with our Lord's coming, as they knew that all judgment had been committed to him. Matt. iii. 12; xvi. 27, 28; John v. 22, 27. His answer contains the following correspondences.

Coming. False Christs. (4, 5.)
The end. Declarative. (6—22.)
Coming. False Christs and false prophets. (23—28.)
The Son of man. | Coming. (29, 30.)
Gathering. (31.)
The end. Illustrative. (32—51, xxv. 1—30.)
The Son of man. | Coming. (31.)
Gathering. (32—46.)

The coming of false Christs and false prophets was fulfilled within the specified period, as we read in Acts v. 36, 37; xiii. 6; and 1 John iv. 1; on which it may be observed, that, though many similar impostors have since arisen, yet, on account of their not falling under the notice of the apostles, they are not included in the prediction. The same observation is applicable to other particulars.

The end, 6—22, contains the following correspondences.

Events heard: wars, &c. (6—)
Direction. Negative. (—6—)
Reasons. (—6—14.)
Event seen: abomination. (15—)
Directions. Positive. (—15—20.)
Reason. (21, 22.)

As the fulfilment of these events is undisputed, I shall only notice that the preaching of the Gospel, ver. 14, to all the nations of the empire, (οικουμενη) is affirmed in Rom. x. 18, and Col. i. 6, 23.

The end, 32—51, xxv. 1—30, contains as follows.

Circumstances. | Nearness. Parable. (32—36.)
| Suddenness. Example. (37—41.)
Warning. (42—44.)
Servants. Responsibility with respect to occupation. (45—51.)

Circumstance: preparation. Parable. (xxv. 1—12.)
Warning. (13.)
Servants. Responsibility with respect to diligence. (14—30.)

The correspondences of the remaining parts reflect much light on each other. The Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven "with great power and glory," (xxiv. 30,) and his coming "in his glory," (xxv. 31,) are evidently the same event, reference being made to the former by the adverb "when" in the latter; and, as the former is included in the events to be fulfilled within that generation, xxiv. 34, the same is true of the latter. The gathering in xxiv. 31 and xxv. 32 are partly the same, the latter being the more comprehensive, as including, not only the "elect," but "all the nations," (παντα τα εθνη,) to whom the Gospel, according to xxiv. 14, had been preached; and the etaneous punishment and the etaneous life, ver. 46, fall in with the many threatenings and promises connected with this period, to be found in other parts of Scripture. The following are some of the plainest.

Ps. i, lviii, xcvii, cx, cxlix; Isai. i. 20—31, v. 1—7, xxiv—xxvi, lxiv—lxvi; Jer. xix; Ezek. vii. 1—16; Dan. xii. 1—3; Joel iii; Mal. iii. 18,* iv. 1—3;† Matt. iii. 7, 10, 12, vii. 19, 20, 22, 23, x. 14, 15, xi. 20—24, xiii. 24—43, 47—50, xvi. 27, 28, xxi. 28—44, xxiii. 33, Comp. Jer. xix; Luke xiii. 1—9, 23—30, xvi. 19—30, xix. 11—27, 41—44; 1 Thess. v. 2, 3; 2 Thess. ii. 1—12; Cor. iii. 10—15; 2 Cor. v. 10, Comp. Rom. xiv. 10, and Luke xxi. 36; Rom. ii. 3—10; James v. 1—9; Heb. x. 26—31, xii. 25—29; 1 Pet. ii. 6—9, iv. 17—19; 2 Pet. iii. 7—13, Comp. Isai. lxv. 17—25, Matt. xxiv. 35, and Rev. xxi. 1; Rev. iii. 3, xvi. 15—18, xiv. 14—20, xx. 11—15, xxii. 11—15.

From this general examination of Matt. xxiv and xxv, it appears that they speak of but one coming, which we know to be long past; and, by tracing the terms occurring in them through other related parts of Scripture, we shall be led to the same conclusion.

Παρουσια, *presence, coming.* This term occurs in Matt. xxiv. 3, 27, 37, 39; and also in the following places: 1 Thess. ii. 19, iii. 13, iv. 15, v. 23; 2 Thess. ii. 1, 8; 1 Cor. xv. 23; James v. 7, 8; 1 John ii. 28, Comp. 1 Thess. iii. 13, and 2 Thess. ii. 1, with Matt. xxiv. 31.

Ερχομαι, to *come.* It occurs in Matt. xxiv. 30, 42, 44, 48, xxv. 6, 10, 13, 19, 27, 31; and also in the following places. Matt. x. 23, xvi. 27, 28, xxvi. 64; John xxi. 22, 23; Acts i. 9—11, Comp. with Luke xxi. 27; 1 Cor. iv. 5, xi. 26; Jude 14; Rev. i. 7, iii. 11.

A corresponding application is made of the following words.

Αποκαλυψις, *revelation,* 2 Thess. i. 7; 1 Cor, i. 7; 1 Pet. i. 7, 13, iv. 13. Comp. 2 Thess. i. 7, and 1 Pet. iv. 13, with Luke xxi. 28.

Επιφανια, *brightness, manifestation.* 2 Thess. ii. 8; Tit. ii. 13. Comp. as in the preceding 1 Tim. vi. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 1, 8.

Επιφανης, *illustrious.* Acts. ii. 20.

Φανερωω, to *make manifest*; in the passive, to be *apparent*, to *appear.* Col. iii. 4; 1 John ii. 28, iii. 2.

Συντελεια του αιωνος, the *consummation of the age.* This phrase occurs in Matt. xxiv. 3, and also in the following places: Matt. xiii. 39, 40, 49, xxviii. 20.

* "And ye shall again discern between the righteous and the wicked." As your fathers did, when chastised by the Assyrians and Babylonians.—Newcome.

† The disciples of the Messiah shall be preserved from the destruction by the Romans.—Ibid.

Τελος, the *end*. It occurs in Matt. xxiv. 6, 13, 14, and also in the following places: Matt. x. 22; 1 Thess. ii. 16; I Cor. i. 8, xv. 24, 2 Cor. i. 13; Phil. iii. 19; Heb. iii. 6, 14, vi. 8, 11; 1 Pet. i. 9, Comp. with Matt. xxiv. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 7, 17; Rev. ii. 26.

Ἡ γενια αυτη, *this generation*. This phrase occurs in Matt. xxiv. 34, and also in the following places: Matt. xi. 16, xii. 41, 42, 45, xxiii. 36; Mark viii. 12, 38; Luke xvii. 25; Acts ii. 40. Whitby distinctly shows, that it "never bears any other sense in the New Testament than the men of this age."

Κλεπτης, a *thief*. It occurs in Matt. xxiv. 43, and is applied to the same period in the following places: Rev. iii. 3, xvi. 15; 1 Thess. v. 2, 4; 2 Pet. iii. 10.

Ἡ ἡμερα εκεινη, *that day*. This expression occurs in Matt. xxiv. 36, and also in 2 Tim. iv. 8, i. 12, 18; in the two last of which its usage, without an antecedent, shows its current application to a single event. It is called "the day of God," 2 Pet. iii. 12.

of Christ," 2 Thess. ii. 2; Phil. i. 6, 10, ii. 16.

of the Lord," 1 Thess. v. 2; 1 Cor. i. 8, v. 5; 2 Cor. i. 14; 2 Pet. iii. 10.

of visitation," 1 Pet. ii. 12. Comp. Luke xix. 44.

of wrath," Rom. ii. 5; Rev. vi. 17.

of salvation," 2 Cor. vi 2.

of redemption," Eph. iv. 30. Comp. Luke xxi. 28, and Rev. vii. 3.

of judgment," Matt. x. 15, xi. 22, 24, xii. 36; 2 Pet. ii. 9, iii. 7; 1 John iv. 17, Acts xvii. 31; Rom. ii. 16.

"the great day," Jude vi.

"the evil day," Eph. vi. 13. Comp. Luke xxi. 36.

"the day," I Cor. iii. 13.

"the day approaching," Rom. xiii. 12; Heb. x. 25.

The same proximity is expressed in the following passages. Matt. x. 23, xvi. 27, 28, xxiv. 33; Luke xviii. 8; John xxi. 22, 23; Rom. xvi. 20; James v. 8, 9; Heb. x. 37; 1 Pet. iv. 5, 7; 2 Pet. ii. 1 3; Rev. i. 1, iii. 11, xxii. 6, 7, 12, 20. And here it is important to remark, that the verb μελλω, according to the most able critics, expresses the proximity of every event with which it is connected. "Μελλων often means not only *future*, but *near*. There is just such a difference between εσται and μελλει εσεσθαι in Greek as there is between *it will be*, and *it is about to be* in English."—Campbell. "Μελλω with an infinitive *to be about* to do a thing."—Parkhurst. See also Harris's Hermes, in which he calls this form the "Inceptive Present." This verb occurs 108 times in the New Testament, out of which I select the following; because thus proved to be erroneously imagined to speak of still future events.

Coming. Matt. xvi. 27.

Time. 1 Tim. vi. 19.

Age. Heb. vi. 5.

Trumpets. Rev. viii. 13, x. 7.

Events. Mark xiii. 4; Luke xxi. 7, 36; Rev. i. 19.

Resurrection. Acts xxiv. 15.

Trial. Rev. iii. 10.

Judgment. Acts xxiv. 25; of the empire, Acts xvii. 31; of quick and dead, at his appearing and his kingdom, 2 Tim. iv. 1; by the law of liberty, James ii. 12; of the adversaries, Heb. x. 27.

Life. 1 Tim. iv. 8.

Preservation. Heb. i. 14.

Empire.* Heb. ii. 5.

City. Heb. xiii. 15.

Glory. 1 Pet. v. 1.

---

* Οικουμενη is one of five different words which are all translated "world," to the no small misleading of the English reader. We have no word of corresponding import. It means *the inhabited parts of the earth*, and is generally applied to the Roman Empire; but, in this one place, it is applied to the *spiritual kingdom* about to succeed the then-existing dispensation, or, by a metonomy similar to that in Luke ii. 1, the *subjects* of that kingdom.

Wrath, Matt. iii. 7.
Rule of the nations. Rev. xii. 5. Comp. Ps. ii. 9, and Matt. xxv. 31—46.
The beast. Rev. xvii. 8.
θλιψις μεγαλη, &c. *great affliction*, &c. Matt. xxiv. 21, cited from Dan. xii. 1. Our Lord's citation of this passage here, and of verse 2, as already noticed in John v. 28, 29, fixes both to this period; and the same remark is applicable wherever an equivalent note of time or an equivalent expression occurs, particularly where both occur together, as in some of the following.
The consummation of the age. The harvest. Matt. xiii. 39; John iv. 35; Rev. xiv. 15.
The end. Deliverance. Matt. x. 22; 1 Pet. i. 9. Subjugation. 1 Cor. xv. 24. Destruction. Phil. iii. 19. Wrath. 1 Thess. ii. 16. Burning. Matt. iii. 12; John xv. 6; Heb. vi. 8.
Resurrection. Matt. xxii. 23—32; Luke xiv. 14; Acts iv. 2, xvii. 18, xxiii. 6, 8, xxiv. 21.
The judgment of Gehenna. Matt. xxiii. 33. Comp. Jer. xix.
The judgment. (ἡ κρισις) Matt. xii. 20, 41, 42; John v. 22; Rev. xiv. 7, xviii. 10; (το κριμα) Rom. ii. 2, 3; 1 Pet. iv. 17; 2 Pet. ii. 3; Rev. xvii. 1, xviii. 20.
Judgment. (κρισις) Matt. xii. 18; John v. 24, 27, xii. 31, xvi. 8, 11; Heb. x. 27; James ii. 13; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude 15; (κριμα) Matt. xxiii. 14; John ix. 39. For the time of resurrection and judgment, comp. the previous references annexed to the remarks on μελλω.

It may possibly be objected, that the word μελλω is used to express, not only what is *really* near, but what is *considered* as near, though indefinitely distant; that it is thus used in Acts xxvi. 22; Rom. v. 14; Gal. iii. 23; Col. ii. 17; Heb. x. 1, and xi. 20; and therefore *may* be so used in the passages to which I have referred. There is, however, this circumstantial difference: the time of our Lord's second coming was undetermined, till fixed by himself to the existing generation; and therefore when the verb μελλω is subsequently applied to this event or its concomitants, it must be understood with the same limitation. "We should," as Dr. Lee observes, "transfer ourselves, as much as possible, into the times in which such declarations are made;" and consider in what manner they would most probably be then understood. Our Lord having so distinctly said that his coming would be within that generation, "it was," as the same writer observes, "scarcely possible that a day, or even an hour, should pass, without some reference being made to it;" (Dissertations, p. 217, 291;) and hence, when we find it connected, both by the apostles and by our Lord himself, with "the consummation of the age," or, as more briefly called, "the end," we have no warrant for applying these expressions, when occurring in subsequent Scriptures, to any other.

Acts i. 11.

This passage is generally supposed to assert, in strictly literal terms, a yet unfulfilled personal coming of the Lord: a supposition which is nullified by a connected view of the subject. A *cloud*, in figurative illustration, affords a natural image of calamity; and is used by the prophets to indicate the horrors of war. "Behold, he shall come up as clouds, and his chariots shall be as a whirlwind: his horses are swifter than eagles. Woe unto us! for we are spoiled." Jer. iv. 13. "Thou shalt ascend and come up like a storm; thou shalt be like a cloud to cover the land, thou and all thy bands, and many people with thee." Ezek. xxxviii. 9. "Behold, Jehovah rideth on a swift cloud, and shall come into Egypt; and the idols of Egypt shall be moved at his presence, and the heart of Egypt shall melt in the midst of it." Isai. xix. 1. This last example is exactly to the point. Literally, it expresses a personal coming, and that even of Jehovah himself; but it is shown, by the context, to prefigure anarchy and invasion. But most important of all is the employment of this image in Daniel's prediction of our Lord's judicial coming—"I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of

heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him."—chap. vii. 13. I say this is the most important of all; because often cited and applied to himself, not only in connection with the same event, but with its frequently asserted proximity, of which the most remarkable is his declaration to the high priest—"Henceforth (or, as in Luke, "From now") ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." Matt. xxvi. 64; Luke xxii. 69. This surely puts the true sense of the passage before us beyond all reasonable doubt; for, as this application, both of person and time, must have been fully in the recollection of his disciples, it follows, when a cloud received him out of their sight, that the angelic speakers applied it, and that their auditors understood them to apply it, in the same, and not in a different sense. We accordingly find the same application of manner and time in the Apocalypse—"Behold, he cometh with clouds," chap. i. 7—"Surely, I come quickly," chap. xxii. 20.

Doctor Lee comments on the passage thus,—"'*This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven:*" that is, *in the clouds of heaven, with signs of power, and in great glory:* for this is *the manner* in which he then ascended. Besides, He Himself says, evidently for the purpose of doing away every expectation of a personal revelation of himself (John xiv. 19), '*Yet a little while, and* THE WORLD SEETH ME NO MORE.' But, if '*every eye*' should *sensibly* see Him (Rev. i. 7), then the *whole world* should. And again, which is perhaps more to our purpose, as it has in view the very *period* now referred to, Matt. xxiv. 23, &c. '*Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there, believe it not.*' And again (ib. ver. 26), '*Wherefore, if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert, go not forth; behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not.* For *as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even to the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be:*' i. e. *in power,* not visibly and *personally,* but *as in the clouds of heaven.* (Comp. Zech. ix. 14—17, inclus.) To take refuge therefore in a strictly *literal* interpretation of this place, and so to extract a *personal* appearance of Christ, is contrary to the manifest intention of Scripture, and to every fact of these times, and deserves not a moment's further consideration."—Inquiry into the Nature, Progress, and End of Prophecy. p. 108, 109.

It is remarkable, that the prediction, in Mal. iv. 5, respecting the mission of our Lord's forerunner, was misunderstood precisely in the same way. The mistake of the Scribes was, however, more excusable than ours; as, till the announcement of the angel to Zechariah, (Luke. i. 17,) which was not generally made known, there was no authorized correction of it. We, on the contrary, have long had the uniform evidence of every passage connected with the subject against the literal sense.

Heb. ix. —26—28.

This is the only passage in which the coming of our Lord is called a *second appearing*; and I have met with but one explanation of it which I consider as giving the true sense. See Select Sermons, by Hosea Ballou, Boston, United States, 1832. This explanation, which occupies the whole of the first sermon, appears very plain, at a single view, in the arrangement; which I here add both in the original and a translation. The first and last clauses do not read smoothly in English; but our sole present concern is with the correspondences.

A | a | —— νυν δε, { ἅπαξ, (—26—)
{ επι συντελειᾳ των αιωνων,
b | εις αθετησιν ἁμαρτιας,
c | δια της θυσιας αὐτου,
d | πεφανερωται. (—26.)

B | e | Και καθ' ὁσον αποκειται τοις ανθρωποις (27—)
f | ἅπαξ αποθανειν,
g | μετα δε τουτο κρισις· (—27.)

B' | e' | οὑτω και ὁ Χριστος (28—)
f' | ἅπαξ προσενεχθεις
g' | εις το πολλων ανενεγκειν ἁμαρτιας.

A | a | Εκ δευτερου,
b | χωρις αμαρτιας,
d | οφθησεται,
c { τοις αυτον απεκδεχομενοις
{ εις σωτηριαν. (—28.)

A | a | —— but now { once, (—26—)
{ in the consummation of the ages,
b | for the putting away of sin,
c | by the sacrifice of himself,
d | he has appeared. (—26.)
B | e | And as it is appointed to the men (27—)
f | once to die,
g | and after this judgment;
B | e | so also Christ (28—)
f | was once offered
g | to bear the sins of many.

A | a | The second time,
b | without sin
d | he shall be seen,
c { by those who look for him,
{ to salvation. (—28.)

A | Appearing in flesh. | a | Time: first. (—26—)
b | sin put away. Intention.
c | Means: sacrifice.
d | Appearance. (—26.)
B | Typical. | e | The men. (27—)
f | Their death, once.
g | Judgment.
B | Antitypical. | e | Christ. (28—)
f | His offering, once.
g | Bearing the sins of many.
A | Appearing in spirit. | a | Time: second.
b | sin put away. Accomplishment.
d | Appearance.
c | End or object: salvation. (—28.)

—— "by the sacrifice of himself." Dan. ix. 24.

—— "to the men," namely, the high priests, referring to ver. 25, where codex 73 of Griesbach and Scholz reads οἱ ἀρχιερεις εισερχονται. This however makes but little difference, as a succession of persons is often expressed by a collective singular.

—— "once to die," that is representatively in their sacrifices, on the day of atonement "once a year," (Lev. xvi. 34,) to which special reference is here made. With respect to their annual or daily repetition, the sacrifices occurred "often" (Heb. ix. 25, x. 1, 11); but, with respect to each several year, they are considered as occurring but "once," for the purpose of typifying the "one sacrifice" of Christ. In this way only could this circumstance be typified at all.

—— "but, after this, judgment," or "a judgment." Entrance, after this death, invested with the breast-plate of judgment, into the holy place. Exod. xxviii. 29, 30.

—— "to bear the sins of many:"—as typically represented by the breast-plate of judgment borne by Aaron on his heart. According to the common explanation, there is no analogy between the two clauses of the comparison.

—— "who look for him," &c. Alluding to our Lord's encouraging language: "When these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh." Luke xxi. 28. Contrasted with this, the apostle represents the expectation of apostates as "a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which is about to devour the adversaries;" which representation again seems to contain an allusion to our Lord's words: "Men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after the things which are coming on the empire." Heb. x. 27, Luke xxi. 26.

—— "without sin," "to salvation." "He that endureth unto the end, the same shall be saved." Matt. xxiv. 13.

We thus perceive, that our Lord's second coming is identified with that already considered under Matt. xxiv, xxv; and that this passage, contrary to the common explanation, which supposes it to speak of a future and posthumous tribunal, relates to our Lord's priestly office, and to the deliverance of his people from the great impending temporal judgment.

1 Thess. iv. 13—17; 1 Cor. xv. 12—57.

Having fully proved, under Matt. xxiv, xxv, that the time indicated in these passages, ("the coming of the Lord," "the day of the Lord," and "the end,") commenced with the destruction of Jerusalem, it follows, that the resurrection, of which they speak, is a literal resurrection, and not a figurative resurrection in the present life, from the death of sin, the latter not being limited to any particular time. It also follows that the literal resurrection is not, as commonly supposed, a general resurrection of dead bodies, no such event having then occurred.

The subjects of resurrection are divided into two general classes: those who sleep, and those who do not sleep, or who should be living and remaining at the coming of the Lord. Of both classes it is said, that they would all be changed; that the change of the former would terminate an interval called sleep; but that the change of the latter would be immediate, or without any interval. There is no promise of exemption from natural death: resurrection does not consist in the reanimation of sublimated dust; but in the restoration or continuance of conscious existence. Christ, from the time of his resurrection, being possessed of all power in heaven and earth, (Matt. xxviii. 18,) and his exercise of it, for the subjugation of his enemies and the deliverance of his people, being repeatedly expressed under the figure of a "coming," this figure is carried on by representing the saints of former ages as brought with him, and those of future ages as caught away (ἁρπαγησομεθα) to meet him, and so becoming thenceforward one company.

Ver. 15. "For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain to the coming of the Lord, shall not precede them who sleep." As our Lord had declared, that his coming would be within that generation, Paul might well conclude that many of them, and possibly himself, might live to see it.

Ver. 16. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trumpet of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first." "Here we have a *description* of the solemn advent of Christ, expressed by images and types derived from the triumphal entry of of an earthly king taking possession of a kingdom with an armed force. (Koppe.) There is here supposed to be an allusion to Joshua at Jericho, and to the sounding of the trumpets there." Bloomfield. This triumphal entry was effected by the instrumentality of the Roman armies. Matt. xxii. 7. There is also a more direct allusion to the trumpets in the Apocalypse. The Doctor* says, "the best commentators are agreed, that nothing is said, either here or at 1 Cor. xv., of the *wicked;* since the time *they* should arise could be of no moment to their friends, inasmuch as they would rise only to *perdition.*" The "*perdition*" perhaps of their nearest relatives, that is, as these commentators think, their *endless perdition*, "of no moment"!—Does Christian belief diminish benevolence? Does Paul, who, in writing to the Romans, (ii. 31,) condemns the want of "natural affection" as a Heathen vice, assume it here to be a Christian virtue? Surely, even hopeless sorrow is more amiable than this!—A nearer view, however, of these things, will, I trust, be found more consoling.

Ver. 17. "Then we, who are alive and remain, shall be caught away together with them, in clouds," or multitudes, "to meet the Lord in the air," or "into air;" "and so we shall be ever with the Lord." "The air," I think, cannot here mean the material element as a permanent habitation of spiritual bodies;

* The writer regrets having, in former articles, attributed Dr. Bloomfield's Greek Testament with Notes to Bishop Blomfield.

and therefore conceive it to express complete *enlargement* or *deliverance*. רוח is thus used in Esther iv. 14, where it is coupled with יצלה.

1 Cor. xv. 20—24, directs us to the types, Lev. xxiii. in which we find the same parties: the wave sheaf, or "the first fruits of the harvest," ver. 10, representing Christ; the two pentecostal loaves, baked with leaven, also called the first fruits, ver. 16, 17, representing the two houses of Judah and Israel, (Ezek. xxxvii. 22; John x. 16; James i. 1, 18; 1 Pet. ii. 25; Rev. vii. 4; xiv. 4.) and also believing Jews and Gentiles (Isai. lvi. 8); and the ingathering, the whole harvest, ver. 39, representing the rest of mankind, otherwise the two loaves and the ingathering would mean the same thing. The apostle does not distinctly say, when the great residue, included in ver. 22, shall be made alive in Christ; but, as he assigns the resurrection of Christ's people to the time of his "coming," the resurrection of the rest appears, by the parallelism, to fall in with "the end;" and, as the former, according to Matt. x. 23, xvi. 27, xxiv. 3, and 1 Pet. iv. 17, was at the end of the Jewish dispensation, effected by the destruction of Jerusalem, the latter was at the end of the Gentile dispensation, effected by the destruction of the fourth beast, Luke xxi. 24, Dan. vii. 23—26. It is generally supposed, that the resurrection in 1 Thes. iv. 13—16, 1 Cor. xv. 23, and 51, 52, are all the same; but the circumstances show they are not. The time of the last is assigned to "the last trumpet;" the two former are assigned to the coming of Christ; and therefore "the trumpet of God," mentioned in the first, must be the first trumpet. This view will, I conceive, become more evident under the following enlarged distribution of it.

End of Jewish dispensation. Cotemporaneous events:
- On earth. Election. Matt. xxiv. 31; Rev. vii, xiv. 1—5; James i. 1, 18; 1 Pet. ii. 9; Tit. i. 1—4.
- On earth. Inflictions. Rev. viii. 7; xiv. 7.
- In heaven. Simultaneous resurrection and change of sleeping saints. 1 Thess. iv. 13—16; 1 Cor. xv. 21—23.

Intermediate. Cotemporaneous events:
- On earth. Progressive judgment. Luke xxi. 24; Dan. vii. 23—26; Rev. xiv. 8—11.
- In heaven. Resurrection and change of saints immediately consequent on their several deaths. 1 Thess. iv. 17; Rev. xiv. 13.

End of Gentile dispensation. Cotemporaneous events:
- On earth. Universal subjugation. Rev. xi. 15—18; 1 Cor. xv. 24, 25.
- In heaven. Simultaneous resurrection and change of sleeping residue. 1 Cor. xv. 51—57.

Interminable. Cotemporaneous events:
- On earth. Reign of the saints. Dan. vii. 27; Rev. xxi. 1, 2.
- In heaven. Resurrection and change of all men immediately consequent on their several deaths. Rom. viii. 19—21.

"In forming a connection with flesh, Jesus formed a connection with a nature common to every human being; and, if his connection with flesh is one of the *media* through which he is enabled to convey spiritual blessings *to a few*, the same connection with flesh, as a connection with all, evidently opens up a channel through which he may convey spiritual blessings *to all*."—Thom's Dialogues on Universal Salvation, p. 38. 2nd. edit.

"Besides, if the Jews find their antitype in believers as constituting the true Israel, where are the Gentiles to find their antitype, except in the rest of the family of man?"—Ibid. p. 39.

"It was through being connected with *the whole*, that Jesus became connected with *a part* naturally: it is through his being connected with *a part* that he becomes connected with *the whole*, spiritually. The whole harvest of mankind is his naturally, of which he gave evidence by taking immediate possession of a part, as a first-fruits; but it is by *the waving of the first-fruits*, or immediate salvation of a part, that he ultimately shows himself to have taken complete possession of and saved the whole harvest spiritually. Comp. Lev. xxiii. 9—21, with 1 Cor. xv. 20—28, James i. 18, and Rev. xiv. 4."—Ibid. p. 54. 55.

1 Cor. xv. 26. "Death, the last enemy, is destroyed." Death is called the last enemy, because, being the wages of sin, it is the last that assails human nature; and the conquest of it by the resurrection of Christ, is indifferently expressed by the present passive καταργειται, *is destroyed,* as here, or by the aorist active, καταργησαντος, *having destroyed,* as in 2 Tim. i. 10. There is therefore no reason for translating the former in the future, *shall be destroyed.* Death was destroyed, first in the resurrection of the head, and secondly in that of the members, which renders the victory complete. ver. 54—57. As "all live to God" (Luke xx. 38), death was prospectively destroyed from the beginning; and has been actually destroyed, (that is, κατ-α-ργειται, *un-done, dis-abled, de-stroyed,* or *thrown down,*) from the time that Christ rose from the dead. Indeed, such is the efficacy of this destruction, that, whether deferred and simultaneous, as in the resurrection of sleepers, or instantaneous and successive, as in that of all others, the sensible effect is the same to all; because the duration of an unconscious state, however long, appears to the individual as nothing.*

It is affirmed, without exception, that "the day of death is better than the day of birth" (Eccles. vii. 1); but the mass of mankind, not knowing this, are, through fear of death, all their life-time subject to bondage. But Jesus took part of our flesh and blood to deliver us from this bondage; (Heb. ii. 14, 15); and this he does by bestowing on believers "the spirit of adoption," by which, even now, they cry, "Abba, Father;" and finally by delivering all others "from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." Rom. viii. 15, 21. Lightfoot says, on ver. 23, "we wait for the redeeming and adopting of the Gentiles to make up our mystical body." Vol vi. p. 323. Pittman's edit. But *unwilling subjection to vanity* is not confined to the Gentiles: it is the inheritance of all men. The deliverance therefore must include the whole human race. Besides, the exigencies of a part cannot equal those of the whole; from which it follows, that the blessings now conferred on a part of mankind, will *much more* be extended, in a future state, to the whole.

R. R.

Summary of "An Inquiry into the Nature, Progress, and End of Prophecy. By Samuel Lee, D.D. London: *Seeley, Fleet Street.* 1849."

(*Continued from page* 39.)

BOOK II.

AN EXPOSITION OF THE VISIONS OF DANIEL AS FAR AS THEY RELATE TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CHRIST'S KINGDOM ON EARTH.

Chapter I.—On the periods of the four great monarchies.

Sect. I.—*On Daniel's Period of Seventy Weeks.*

Dan. ix. 24—27. This portion of Scripture is not connected with, nor does it require elucidation from, that contained in any other chapter; though other portions need the limitations prescribed in this.

Omit the definite article in ver. 24, and read—"*to seal vision and prophecy;*" or, in other words, to complete or fulfil it. The shadowy services of the temple close with prophecy, and the establishment of everlasting righteousness supervenes.

By finishing transgression and making an end of sins, the complete reconciliation made by Christ is indicated, Heb. x. 14—22,—by everlasting right-

* Eccles. ix. 5, 6, 10. Solomon therefore judges, that the dead altogether sleep, and that they are wholly insensible. There they lie, not numbering days or years; but they seem to themselves, at their resurrection, to have scarcely slept a moment.—Luther. Annot. in Eccles. Tome 3, fol. 272, edit. Jen. 1603.

eousness, the introducing of that system, which should be everlasting, and give place to no other; but endure as long as mankind shall exist: everlasting in contradistinction to the temporary system of the Law.

To seal signifies to complete. To anoint the most holy: i. e. to consecrate the new holy of holies, or Church of the New Jerusalem, by the visible appearance of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost.

Having explained those expressions in this scripture that appeared somewhat obscure, let us now turn our attention to the periods given by the angel; and, first, the seventy weeks. On this we observe, that these weeks are suggested by the "seventy years" of Jer. xxv. 11, 12; and that we have not here a chronological, but an indefinite period: that the events to take place in the period, and not the specific time, make the prophecy clear and precise. In ver. 25, we have sixty-nine weeks given to us, within which Messiah was to come. This is the point to which our present attention is to be fixed, and within these sixty-nine weeks Messiah shall be cut off. In ver. 26, instead of "and *after* threescore," read "and *within* three-score," as in the case of Matt. xxvii. 63, "but within three days I will rise again." The city and the sanctuary were destroyed after Messiah was cut off, and after the expiration of the sixty-nine weeks. Ver. 27, "*He shall confirm*" (lit. *magnify*) "*the covenant with*" the "*many for one week.*" The definite article is certainly to be understood here, intended, as Dr. Lee observes, most likely to signify mankind universally. The sacrifice and oblation ceased with the fate of the sanctuary. "*The end shall be*" as "*with a flood,*" i. e. overwhelming. All here is indefinite: no exact measure of time is to be looked for: the occurrence of events, is the only measure of time. Until the end desolations are determined. Luke xxi. 21—24.

We have, then, in these seventy weeks, four great events predicted. Let us enumerate them.

1. The rebuilding of Jerusalem,	7
2. Within the succeeding sixty-two weeks, Messiah to be cut off,	62
3. Within the last week, the city and sanctuary to fall,	1
4. The power of the Desolator to terminate with it,	—
	70 weeks

"But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only," being the words of our blessed Saviour, clearly determine that these seventy weeks are not given as a strictly chronological period; or else the event could have been exactly calculated and known: instead of which, he gave his disciples certain signs as indicating its approach, its beginning, and end; and, among other things, particularly recommends this very prophecy of Daniel to their intelligent perusal. Matt. xxiv. 15.

Sect. II.—*On the Four Great Monarchies.* Dan. ii.

We have here four great kingdoms: i. e. systems of universal rule, which succeed each other: the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Grecian, and the Roman; and these are to be succeeded by a fifth, which shall fill the whole world, so that no portion of the four preceding ones shall remain, but shall be destroyed. The fifth is to stand for ever. The expressions *hereafter* and *latter days* are identical. This last having no end, can have no latter days; and so the period denominated by these terms must of necessity happen before the full establishment of the fifth monarchy. The fourth empire Dr. Lee considers to be Heathen Rome, symbolized by the iron; and, in its weak and corrupt state, by the feet and toes part of iron and part of clay. He dates the period of its deterioration to the time of Augustus, when the iron empire yielded to the mixture of miry clay, in the effeminacy, weakness, and disunion, that appeared among its elements. It was some time after this had taken place, that the Baptist's voice was heard in the wilderness, "Repent, for the kingdom" or reign "of heaven is at hand." During the decline of Rome, its sun rose to set no more, and its beams spread far and wide over the world: kings became its nursing fathers, and queens its nursing mothers.

SECT. III.—*On the Seventh and Eighth Chapters of Daniel, and particularly on the Little Horn.*

The little horn of these two chapters is one and the same, and symbolizes the system of Romish rule, which destroyed Jerusalem, and then made war on the saints of Christ; and in which he prospered and practised till, in his turn, he fell and rose no more. In chap. viii, we are told this little horn rose out of one of Alexander's four powers, and became a great horn, such as his own had been. The Romans took possession of Macedon 160 years before Christ. This little horn, we are also informed, extended itself into the territories of three others; East, North, and South. This power then was so situated as to have Egypt (under Ptolemy) on the South, India and Babylon (under Seleucus) on the East, with the dependencies of Asia Minor (under Symmachus) on the North. And this was exactly the position of Heathen Rome after its first series of rule; when it subdued these three kings. And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them, (viii. 9, 10, seq.) till it consummated its destructiveness in the siege of Jerusalem, and destroyed the mighty and the holy people.

We have in ver. 14, another number given to us, 2300 days. Whatever its extent may be, the seventy weeks of Daniel must be its limit; for there is no getting further than "*the end.*" Compare Dan. viii. 13, 14, with ix. 24. They are but an echo of the same event. The best interpretation, therefore, of this number is, that it is an indefinite number of considerable length, and it extends to the day of the Lord. Daniel's seventy weeks are divided into two parts, corresponding to evening and morning, and summer and winter. The meaning therefore of ver. 14 is—*Until* (the) *day* (shall be) 2300 *days*; *and the sanctuary shall be sanctified*; evening and morning being a periphrasis for a day, Gen. i. 5. Compare Zech. xiv. 1—11, and 2 Pet. iii. 8.

For *the sanctuary and host trodden under foot*, see Luke xxi. 24, and Rom. xi. 25. That is, until this *great day of the Lord* should have come to its close. Sacred Scripture is silent about Jerusalem after its destruction.

CHAPTER II.

SECT. I.—*On the Successors of Alexander the Great, Antiochus, Ptolemy, &c.*

It is not necessary to enter into the details of this prophecy further than they concern the fourth and the fifth or last empire, of the prophet. See x. 1 and 14. Though the predictions embraced a long time previous to their fulfilment, that time was limited to "the latter days." ii. 28. The predictions are but a repetition with more particularity of detail. As to the person making this revelation (x. 5—7.) he is evidently the same as in Rev. i. 14, 15, viz. *God himself* in the person of *the Son.*

In chapter xi. no mention is made of the first or Babylonian empire. It commences with Persia; then we have Greece; and then our fourth, or Roman iron empire. Xerxes is evidently the fourth king spoken of in ver. 2, who stirs up all against the realm of Grecia. Then, in ver. 3, we have Alexander the Great. See also Dan. viii. 8, and 21, seq. Then from ver. 5 to 9, we have the war between Egypt and Antiochus. Ver. 10 – 19 also relate to the actions of Antiochus, and were fully accomplished. The king of the North was Seleucus Callinicus, who had two sons, Ceraunus and Antiochus the Great. This latter was the king who waged war with Ptolemy, king of the South, and defeated him at Raphia. See Sir Isaac Newton on Daniel, vol. ix. p. 197, edit. 1747.

SECT. II.—*On the Interference of the Roman Power with the Successors of Alexander; its Destruction of the Theocracy: its own Fate.*

With the defeat at Raphia end the exploits of Antiochus. He did not take away the daily sacrifice, nor did he place the abomination that maketh desolate over against the temple, nor did those that understoood instruct many, xii. 4; for

with these times he had no part or lot. The time of xii. 1, is not that of Antiochus, but of Matt. xxiv. 21, which speaks of a time of greater trouble, of which more presently. Dr. Lee considers Numb. xxiv. 24, a prediction of the humbling of Antiochus, which was in this wise. On his capture, the Roman General, Popilius, made a circle round him, and suffered him not to move out of it until he submitted: when he exclaimed, "Then I must satisfy you, Popilius. I will do what the republic expects from me." On this he wreaked his vengeance on unoffending Jerusalem. But whatever his cruelties were, he did not those things mentioned above; nor was it by him, that the daily sacrifices ceased.

Dr. Lee shows how the Roman rule made the different portions of the Grecian its own. Macedon had become a Roman province, and the East was finally merged in the time of Pompey. Julius Cæsar made Pontus and Asia Minor a province, and Octavius and Augustus reduced Egypt to the same fate. With these four Empires it included other states, and eventually it became the greatest and most powerful that ever existed; and in this respect was diverse from all that had preceded it. Another remarkable fulfilment of the prophecy was, that the seeds of its desolation were now sown. During the Dictatorship of Julius Cæsar it was that its legs of iron began to fail; and the miry clay, which the wealth of the world poured into it, infused its luxury and its effeminacy; which became its confirmed character in the days of Augustus.

xi. 31. "Arms shall stand on his part:" i. e. *strength, power.*—For the meaning of the abomination that maketh desolate, see 1 Mac. i. 41—52; 2 Mac. vi. 2, seq. *βδελυγμα, Religio Romanorum.*

Ver. 32. Compare viii. 25. The power is to heathenize by smooth things, causing them to apostatize—"*by peace,*" read "*by dissoluteness* or *effeminacy.*" The only character of Rome, whose wisdom was policy and craft, and whose progress was marked by cruelty and weakness. Matt. xxiv. 10, 11; 2 Pet. ii. 1. The apostacy, 2 Thess. ii. 3, now began to show itself. "*But the people who know their God shall be strong and do exploits.*" The apostles and primitive Christians did what Rome and Greece could never do: even rustics were wiser and better than the greatest philosophers. They changed the religion of the world!

"They that understand shall instruct many" (lit. "*the many*"), ix. 27; xii. 3, 4. "Yet they shall fall by the sword," so again, ver. 35. Comp. vii. 10; vii. 21, 25; viii. 24. "To try them," as Israel in the wilderness. But, at ver. 34, there is "a little help;" and so, after the early persecutions of the apostles and Christians, emperors became mild, and tacitly aided Christianity. One embraced its doctrines, which made their way into every village of the empire; until Satan, unable to shed their blood any longer, plied his softer arts.

Ver. 35—45. Compare ix. 27. The indignation is the same. This is the end of Daniel's seventy weeks. This power does not come into action till the fall of Jerusalem, which takes place in the midst of the last week. This time therefore is the last half week, vii. 25; and xii. 7, the last *time, times, and a-half*: i. e. in each case *three and a-half.*

At xii. 11 we have another number connected with these judgments: 1290 days. Comp. Rev. xi. 9, 11; Ezek. xxxix. 8—10. There is however an excess of thirty days over the 1260. Beyond "*the end*" it is impossible to go: this must therefore be some time before the temple fell, and the Roman idolatrous ensigns set up; to fill up which space these additional days, as Dr. Lee thinks, are given. During this space and up to its close, those that understood should be tried and purged, and made clean. See Amos ix. 9; Zech. xiii. 9; Is. lxvi 19; Luke xxii. 31; 1 Pet. iv. 12, seq., and v. 8, seq.

Sect. III.—*On the Blasphemy of the Little Horn, or Antichrist: his Fall, and the Establishment of the Kingdom of the* Son of Man.

Dan. xi. 36—45, is but the echo of vii. 19—27, and viii. 19—26, with additional information; and indicates the peculiarly murderous character of the Little Horn: heathen Rome, and especially Nero and Domitian. The latter tyrant, during his life-time, assumed the title of *the Lord God*; and insisted on

being worshipped. He also allowed no statues but those of himself; and those to be of silver and gold, and of a certain weight; which was surely to honour a god that his fathers knew not, and to magnify himself above them all. At ver. 40 of this chapter we have the extreme limit, or the end of Daniel's seventieth week. On the fall of Maximinus, Licinius succeeded to the entire rule of the East; but, not being satisfied with this, Constantine, now sole emperor, allowed him to have Egypt and Libya. He nevertheless sought the ruin of Constantine, who came upon him with fury, overcame him, and compelled him to an ignominious flight. A reconciliation however took place, through the entreaties of Constantine's sister, whom he had married; but, shortly after, he rebelled again, and the battle of Byzantium, with a naval engagement at a port in Attica, terminated the struggle. Licinius submitted, and was sentenced to death. These facts of history run parallel to the prophecy, and show that it was fulfilled to the letter.

Dan. xii. 1. "At that time," i. e. some period within the last week of the prophet's seventy. Matt. xxiv. 21, seq. sufficiently show the date of these sorrows, and ought to suffice to every believer. But who are the people here to be delivered, called "thy people?" Surely the elect of Matthew, and the remnant of Isaiah and Jeremiah, are identical with Daniel's people. It was the remnant that escaped these sorrows; for whose sake they were shortened; and who carried the glad tidings of the world's salvation, by Christ, to the ends of the earth. Col. i. 20—23; Matt. x. 18.

Ver. 2. "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake," i. e. in a first resurrection with Christ, (Rom. vi. 3—6,) and "some to shame and everlasting contempt," i. e. awakened to hear, through the preaching of the Gospel, the judgment denounced against *unbelief*, and to feel this in a general overthrow. So likewise Luke ii. 34.

Ver. 3 and 4 refer to the glories of those who preach the gospel, until the time of the end; when the seals are broken by the lion of the tribe of Judah.

Ver. 7, as often insisted on, is to be reckoned from the fall of Jerusalem to the end of Daniel's seventieth week. The angel adds, "And when he shall have accomplished to scatter abroad the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished." That is, when the *Son of man*, as Abraham's spiritual seed, shall (*de facto*) take the kingdom as the spiritual heir of the whole earth; and shall, in a peculiar manner, bless those his servants who have outlived Jacob's sorrow. The more this subject is studied the more it must become apparent that the new covenant is entirely a spiritual system; that it has nothing to do with Pope, Mahomet, or carnal Jews; but to show, by the light of the Holy Spirit and the word, that Christ is now in the heavens—that they and all who hear the glad tidings must put away their sin; and, as regenerated by the same Spirit, now enter by faith the same heavens, and through His grace be made more than conquerors over the delusions of the world, the flesh, and the devil.

Sect. IV.—*On the Antichrist of the New Testament, the Man of Sin, Son of Perdition*, &c.

Having ascertained the power who should make war on the saints in the latter days to be heathen Rome, it now remains to inquire who the latter ruler, so pre-eminently wicked among these rulers, was. The following passages of Scripture must be consulted in the first place: 2 Thess. ii. (where instead of "falling away" in ver. 3, read THE *apostacy*); Matt. xxiv. 19, seq.; 2 Pet. ii. 1; Matt. x. 2; Luke xxi. 16—37; 1 John iv. 1; 2 John i. 7. These Scriptures sufficiently indicate the character of the man, and the position of the saints under his rule. Now turn to Is. xiv, the first verse of which plainly brings us to the times when the Gentiles were to be joined with God's people: that, is, in those of the apostles and their immediate successors. The Roman power is necessarily had in view both here and in Daniel; and as, in the times of St. Paul, it occupied the station which that of Babylon once did, it is, in the Revelation, *mystically* styled *Babylon*. Comp. xlvii. 8, 10, and Zeph. ii. 13—15. But, in Is. xiv. 24—26, the fall predicted of it is denounced against the

Assyrian; and it is declared, that "This is the purpose that is purposed upon *the whole earth*, and this is the hand that is stretched out upon *all the nations*:" that is, because under this, as universal, all nations should make war against the saints of the Most High. This contains, therefore, a prediction thus *mystically* made, of the assumption of Deity by this very power, and of its fall. Ezekiel (xxviii.) predicts the same thing, also *mystically*, under his prophecy of the fall of Tyre.

We have already adverted to Domitian. A coin or gem of agate has been found on which he is represented as *sitting*, not *in the temple*, but *over against it*; as if he were to be considered himself as *a temple of God*, and hence receiving divine honours.

It was during the period of these rulers of heathen Rome, that the earth experienced her darkest day of trouble, such as never was and never will be again. Of this awful period, from the wars, the famines, and the pestilences that then raged, Gibbon, towards the close of his first volume, says, "*A moiety of human nature perished*;" while some affirm, that the document, on which this was grounded by him, virtually declares *that not the moiety*, but *two-thirds*, of mankind actually fell. All these emperors died under the immediate visitation of God.

Let us then hear the conclusion of the whole matter. We find God made two covenants with Abraham: the first a temporary one, for the Jews, implying the necessity of its cessation, for the Gentiles were to rejoice with God's people; and that they do, in consequence of the second covenant, in which Abraham's seed is constituted the heir of the whole earth, and all nations are blessed in him.

Daniel is the prophet who has given to us the following fixed and certain facts, that enable us to see the close of the first and the rise of the second covenant.

I.—The fall of the four great heathen empires of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome.

II.—The fall of Jerusalem and its temple.

III.—The dispersion of the Jews, who are no longer a people as such.

IV.—The miraculous propagation of the Gospel by the apostles and their converts, in the face of the fiercest persecution the world ever saw.

V.—The establishment of the kingdom of Christ throughout the world.

When we look back to what the Christian church was in those days, and compare her present sad and distracted state, let the remembrance from whence we have fallen excite us to repentance. God in the love of his Son, in the new covenant, does not act upon us as mere machines, but as reasonable beings, who are called upon to walk by faith, not by sight; as candidates for heaven, to be heavenly-minded; and, as spiritual, to be filled with the Spirit. But, if mistaking all this, we begin to walk by sight, and look for blessing from the material and visible, is it to be wondered at, that our candlestick should be removed, that we might be made sensible of our darkness, in order to seek that true apostolic light, which, notwithstanding our sins, shines more and more unto the perfect day? The more we study their conduct and their writings, the more we may learn how those ought to walk, who, as members of the same body, are to walk, even as Christ walked.

PAROIKOS.

(To be concluded in our next.)

THE ENGLISH UNIVERSALISTS' READING SOCIETY, OCTAGON, PLYMOUTH.

The half-yearly meeting of the members of this Society took place, at the Library, on Thursday evening, March 28, 1850, when the following Report was read.

It is with great pleasure and satisfaction, that we look back on the proceedings of the past six months. In the month of September last, it occurred to two or three individuals, that a Library of the kind we have now the great privilege of possessing would not only be advantageous to all who became members, by increasing their own

knowledge, but that, through the circulation of books declaring God's *unlimited love* among the families to which they belong, this most desirable of all knowledge might be extended to the respective branches of each household, that God in Christ might be glorified through their belief of the truth.

By the kind assistance of a few friends, we succeeded in collecting about twenty-five volumes, (treating more or less on the "*Restitution of all things*,") a list of which was printed and circulated among those who were most likely to become members. The result was, that twenty-two individuals subscribed to it before our first meeting, which took place on the first Friday in October, last year. Ever since that period we have been gradually increasing in numbers, till now we have as many as fifty-five snbscribers; and we have been enabled to make occasional additions to the number of our books, until we now have fifty-three volumes, among which there are a few that it may be thought desirable to withdraw from the Library, which no doubt will be done, as soon as we have better to substitute for them. This is certainly rapid progression and improvement. Let us take courage, and each and all lend their very best assistance to promote the interests of this Society; which has for its object the extension of that knowledge, the possession of which gives present peace and happiness, together with making known the *riches of his grace*, who was *in* Christ Jesus *reconciling* the *world* to himself.

One or two valuable and interesting papers have been read at our different meetings, and doubtless afforded great pleasure and information to all who had the opportunity of hearing them. It is earnestly hoped that other members will come forward with papers of a similar kind, that we may mutually grow in the knowledge and love of this most precious truth.

In addition to the foregoing, this society has circulated among its members between forty and fifty copies of *The Universalist* magazine each month since its publication. May it have a still wider circulation, that the truth of God may be carried to the homes and hearts of the people.

A member of this society who most earnestly prays that all hearts may be made as happy as his own, by the reception and right understanding of this most *blessed truth*, has compiled and printed, in the shape of a small pamphlet, a few reasons why Christians believe in the doctrine of Universal Salvation, which he this night, with a cheerful, *thankful*, willing, happy heart, presents to each member in the name of our God of *unchanging love*; most sincerely and affectionately desiring that all may be made partakers of that joy and peace in believing, which this world can neither give nor take away.

It is for this meeting to decide on those measures that may be deemed most desirable to increase the number of members and approved books; together with every other step that may be the means of advancing the cause we so humbly, but warmly espouse.

We have seen what has been done in the very short period of six months. Our library has been established, with its fifty-three volumes, by far the greatest number of which are most unexceptionable books, breathing the very spirit of our *divine Redeemer's love*, which is the *banner of this society*. We have seen that the Centre and Sun of nearly all those books, is the atoning sacrifice of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and, in this sacrifice, we have beheld "merey and truth met together, justice and peace kissing each other." May we not be lukewarm in so glorious a cause, lurking in half obscurity, shrinking as it were from openly declaring our confirmed belief, in the redemption of the world: but may we, at all times, be ready to give a reason for the hope that is in us; and although we, like Paul, may labour and suffer reproach, because "we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of *all men*, especially of those that believe," say to one another, as he did to his companion Timothy, "These things *command* and teach."

Jean Frederic Oberlin's Glimpse of Universal Salvation.

"Vous savez, chers amis! que toute la nature terrestre est une representation du spirituel."

"He (Oberlin) seemed to hope that the passage, 1 Cor. xv. 28, where it is said that 'all things' shall be subjected unto the Almighty, and the Son also himself shall be subjected, that '*God may be all in all*,' might include not only the 'little flock' of Christ's immediate followers, but *ultimately*, at some almost indefinite period, through the boundless mercy of God, and the blood of Jesus, which was shed for the sins of the *whole world—all the race of mankind*. And he was strengthened in this belief by understanding in another than the ordinary sense, that 'as in Adam *all* die, even so in Christ shall *all* be made alive.'"

This Oberlin was the pious and benevolent Pastor of the Ban-de-la-Roche upwards of fifty years. He was born August 31, 1740, and died May, 1826.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

SIR,—I regret to find, from your statements, that the heresy of Universalism is spreading. Not that I am surprised at it, but I regret it.

You invite opponents to write: I am one: an opponent because I believe that Universalism is no part of "*the faith* which was once delivered to the saints," and for which we are exhorted to "contend earnestly." Jude 3.

I would, first, warn my readers that men who *receive not* the love of the truth *that they may be saved*, have strong delusion sent them that they may believe *a lie*. 2 Thes. ii, 11, 12.

I would now desire, as briefly as possible, to present a few truths from God's word destructive of Universalism.

I. The close of this present dispensation is judgment on evil. Evil men, and *seducers*, are waxing *worse and worse*. 1 Tim. iii, 1, 5, 13.

II. When judgment on the *living* rebels is executed by the Lord at his second coming—and he then comes "*with* his saints"—Satan is bound for a thousand years: during which period, Christ and *all* who have part "in the first resurrection" reign.

III. At the close of the thousand years Satan is loosed; and, as if to prove that punishment does not change his malignity, he not only deceives, but leads to a rebellion more daring than ever: see Rev. xx, 8, 9: till, finally, he is cast into the lake of fire "*for ever and ever.*"

And now, observe; by comparing this with Rev. xiv, 9—11, where *men*, not angels, are spoken of: "the smoke of *their* torment ascendeth up *for ever and ever:*" and with Rev. iv, 10, and v. 14: "they worshipped Him that liveth for *ever and ever:*" it can be clearly seen that *eternity* is meant in all these passages.

IV. Again, when "the *new* heavens and the *new* earth" are made, all that is sinful is still spoken of as being in existence, but *outside* the sphere of glory: "without are dogs." See Rev. xxi, 8, 27, xxii, 15.

Universalists treat sin lightly. Indeed, none but the Holy Ghost, who is the Spirit of *Truth*, convicts of sin. And when he does, there is no relief to the sinner till he learns the *precious* value of "the *precious* blood." Sin, either in Satan or in fallen man, is that which, if it could, would kill God himself. Such is its dreadful malignity. If I only regard myself as an *unfortunate* creature, punishment seems severe. But if I know myself *a rebel*, then I see punishment to be just. And hence, too, the sweetness of *mercy*. It flows from the one rebelled against to the sinner. But always "*through* Christ." There can be no salvation without *atonement*. And Jesus took not the nature of *angels:* he became a man, and died, that "*whosoever believeth*" might be saved. Hence, devils and unbelievers must be lost. The man who speaks lightly of sin, obscures God's *grace;* though he may vainly think he is making it look brighter. But holiness and unholiness, light and darkness, can never, never mingle. 2 Cor. vi. 14, 15.

Universalism, as Mr. Thom shows, (p. 5, 6,) has frequently merged into Unitarianism, or some other fatal error. To say, as Mr. Thom does, (p. 4,) that Universalism commenced in "the time of Origen," is at once (though unintentionally) to pronounce it A HERESY; for whatever was not taught by the Lord himself, or his inspired apostles, ought to be rejected at once by those who profess to honour him.

With sincerest desires for the eternal welfare of your own precious soul, and the souls of those who may read these remarks,

I am, yours respectfully,

28, Wilmington Square, March 2, 1850. W. C. BOARDMAN.

[We readily insert Mr. Boardman's letter; wishing for *his* sake, that its contents had been something better than railing accusations, supported by misunderstood passages of Scripture.

To show that this remark on his comments is not merely an expression of *our own* opinion, we refer him to Doctor (recently Professor) Lee's work on Prophecy for multiplied proofs of its long-past fulfilment. When Mr. Boardman refutes these proofs, it will be time enough for us to say any thing on his citations; and, so far as we are personally concerned, think our pages sufficiently evince the misapplication and consequent injustice of his concluding animadversions.

The only thing, indeed, which requires *particular* notice is his captious inference from Dr. Thom's statement, the meaning of which evidently is, not that Universalism "commenced" in the time of Origen, but that he was the first writer of eminence on the subject; and, as to Unitarianism, Mr. Boardman might equally well charge Christianity (as has been often done) with all the crimes and errors of professing Christians. ED.]

THE UNIVERSALIST.

JUNE, 1850.

ON 1 COR. XV. 24—28.

EXTRACTED FROM "ANASTASIS, OR THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY, RATIONALLY AND SPIRITUALLY CONSIDERED." BY GEORGE BUSH, PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, NEW YORK CITY UNIVERSITY.

PROFESSOR BUSH is a Millennarian, and regards the time as still future, when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ. Excepting this, as an error corrected by the more spiritual view of Doctor Lee, which dates it from the close of the seventieth week, Dan. ix. 24—27, or termination of the Roman power, I nevertheless concur with him in rejecting the prevalent interpretation of the passage before us, viz. that it teaches the eventual surrender of the mediatorial kingdom; which he does for the following reasons.

1. That it rests solely and exclusively on this passage, though opposed to many others either clearly affirming or irresistably implying its perpetuity.

Of the former, he cites 2 Sam. vii. 16, and its application in Luke i. 32, 33; Isai. ix. 6, 7; Dan. ii. 44, and vii. 14; Heb. i. 8; Rev. i. 5, 6, xi. 15, and v. 13;—and of the latter, Heb. vii. 21, and i. 2.

"Now in reference to the above citations we cannot doubt, that the kingdom, of which they assure to Jesus the everlasting sovereignty, is the *mediatorial kingdom*. Yet this, if any, is the very kingdom, which Paul is so generally understood to assert, that Christ is one day to deliver up to the Father." . . . "As Christ can be contemplated only in two characters, as God and God-man, so his kingdom or kingship can be viewed only in two respects, as that of God, identical with Jehovah, and of Messiah. But the kingdom of Messiah is the *mediatorial kingdom;* and of that *alone* is the apostle here speaking; and, if he delivers up this kingdom, then it cannot be eternal, as the foregoing extracts unequivocally affirm that it is."

2. That the kingdom spoken of is not the kingdom of Christ, but of the world. "It is no other than that kingdom of Christ and the saints, which displaced and succeeded the kingdom of the four Beasts, and which also became universal under the whole heavens. Such are clearly the announcements of the Old Testament prophets; and can we suppose that Paul, writing under the guidance of the same Spirit, would announce any thing different?"

3. "That the sense ascribed to παραδῷ, *deliver up*, in the established

version, is entirely unwarranted by the current usage of the New Testament writers. Not a single instance can be adduced where the verb has the meaning of *handing*, or *resigning back*, *returning*, unless it be John xix. 30, 'He *gave up the ghost* (παρεδωκε το πνευμα);' and this is by no means decisive, as it may be understood in the general sense of *making over*, *transferring*, which obtains elsewhere throughout the whole New Testament, without a single exception." . . .

4. That the nominative to παραδω, καταργηση, θη, and υποταξει, is not Christ; but that, in common with many other instances, they exemply the rule, according to which "Active verbs, especially of the third person singular, (frequently also in the plural), in many cases assume the signification of the passive, where no nominative is expressed." Thus corrected, the translation runs as follows.

Then cometh the end, when the kingdom shall be made over to God, even the Father; when all rule, and all authority, and power, shall be put down. For he must reign, till all enemies are put under his feet. . . . For all things are subjected under his feet. But when it is said, that all things are subjected, it is manifest, that he is excepted who subjected all things to him. And when all things shall be subjected to him, then also the Son himself shall be subject to him, who subjected all things to him, that God may be all things in all.

Having thus proved the endless reign of Christ, he proceeds to show,

1. That it is not limited by the word "till;" which neither *affirms* nor *denies* any thing beyond the specified period. Misapprehension, however, is, in this case, so common, that the Professor thinks it necessary to cite the following passages in opposition to it. Gen. xxviii. 15; 1 Sam. xv. 35; 2 Sam. vi. 23; Ps. cxii. 8; Isai. xxii. 14, xlii. 4, xlvi. 4; Matt. i. 25, v. 18, xxviii. 20; Rom. v. 13; 1 Tim. iv. 13.

2. That it is not limited by the exception of the Father. "If," he says, "it be true, that it is the Father, who has thus, by his supreme decree, put all things in subjection to Christ, it is of course to be presumed that he will continue to retain pre-eminence; and that *after*, just as *before*, the execution of the decree, the Son will hold the same rank of economical subjection to the Father. A delegated authority necessarily implies a supremacy in him who conferred it. This is undoubtedly the true force of the original τοτε και, *then also*,—that is, *then*, just as *now*—which the common translation entirely fails correctly to represent. Every one can perceive that the expression—'Then shall the Son also himself be subject'—conveys a wholly different idea from 'Then also shall the Son himself be subject.' In the one case, the force of the word 'also' falls upon 'then,' in the other upon 'Son.' The former we conceive, beyond question, to be the genuine sense. The apostle's words, so far from indicating any change in the official relations of Christ as Mediator, have for their express object to affirm directly the reverse. As Christ, in the great mediatorial scheme, *now* holds a place inferior to the Father, so, notwithstanding all the grandeur and glory that is predicted to accrue to him for the final subjection of his enemies, he is still ordained to occupy that subordinate station. His conquests and his crowns still leave him second on the throne."—Anastasis, p. 370—383, passim.

It may be further observed, that, notwithstanding the prevalence of the interpretation here controverted, commentators appear to be em-

barrassed with it. Both Whitby and Bloomfield call the passage "obscure;" and Boothroyd leans to a view, which, though diffidently expressed, plainly coincides with the Professor's. (p. 382.) "As our Lord declared himself the servant of the Father, both as man and mediator, and in all he did and suffered was subject to his will and authority, I know not how he can be more subject, when he has put down all rule, &c.; but in the version given, it will be manifest in that day, that he has been subject, and has fulfilled all righteousness, and accomplished the purpose of the Father's love and mercy. If this be not the sense of the apostle, I do not know his meaning,"—New Family Bible.

For myself I consider the whole question as settled by the declaration that Christ "is the mediator of the new covenant" (Heb. ix. 15): a covenant which will not, as the old has done, "vanish away" (viii. 13); but which will be as lasting as the spiritual promises, on which it is established. (ver. 6—12.)

There are two other subjects intimately connected with the kingdom, or reign, of our Lord; the judgment, and the duration of the universe. On the former, I shall continue to cite from the Professor; and shall reserve the latter for a future article.

"*The judgment runs parallel with the kingdom.* Indeed, the very term 'judge,' in Scriptural usage, implies as truly the exercise of the *royal* as of the *judicial* prerogative. The oracle of Daniel announces the coming of the King, and the setting up of the kingdom of the saints; and nothing is clearer, from the tenor of the prophecy, than that the judgment there spoken of is to be prolonged over an extended tract of centuries, as one form of the kingly sovereignty, which the Messiah, in conjunction with his saints, is to exercise." . . . "This, therefore, is 'the great judgment,' or 'the great day of judgment,' of the Scriptures of truth—a protracted process flowing on in parallel duration with the whole period of the Christian dispensation." p. 280, 281.

"In the citation of the following passages from the Psalms, we take for granted their Messianic application." . . . They are cited at length, but references to them will suffice. Ps. lxxxii. 8, xcvi. 13, xcviii. 9, ix. 8, lxvii. 4, lxxii. 1, 2, 4. "Isaiah, Jeremiah, Micah, and other prophets, reiterate the same testimony." Mic. iv. 3; Isai. xi. 3, 4; Jer. xxiii. 5.

"In all these passages, which are but specimens of multitudes of others of similar import, we read the clear preintimations of one grand character of the Messiah's reign. It was to be a dispensation of *judgment*, even as Christ himself says,—'*The Father hath given him authority to execute judgment.*' And again, John v. 22, 'The Father *judgeth* no man, but hath *committed all judgment* to the Son.' And then the setting up of the kingdom of the Son of man was, in fact, the commencement of this grand process of *judgment*, which was to run parallel with its duration; therefore our Lord, in immediate prospect of that important era, declares, John xii. 31, 'Now in the *judgment of this world;* now shall the prince of this world be cast out;' i. e. this judgment is just upon the eve of entering on its accomplishment. This is but announcing the fulfilment of the Old Testament oracles touching this feature of the administration; the weight of the testimony is not at

all abated by the fact of occasional intimations that he declined being recognized in this character of *judge*, especially in the case of the woman taken in adultery, and of the two brethren disputing about the inheritance, and when he said that he came not to judge, but to save the world. All this may be consistently explained, on the ground that it was not so properly at his *first* as at his *second* coming, that he was to enter upon the functions of this high dignity. But his second coming commenced with the new order of things, which is, in the main, to be dated from the destruction of Jerusalem; when the *session of judgment* took its beginning, which is to be considered as continuing through the whole period of the dispensation." p. 282—284.

. . . "But let it be borne in mind, that this 'coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven,' announced by Daniel, is *precisely the same coming* with that announced by our Saviour in the Gospels, especially Matt. xvi. 27, 28: 'For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily, I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.' So again, Matt. xxiv. 34: 'Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled.' So also Matt. x. 23: 'Verily, I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come.' We hold it to be utterly impossible, upon fair canons of interpretation, to divorce these predictions of Daniel from a joint reference to one and the same coming, and that too a coming that was to be realized, *in its incipient stages*, at the destruction of Jerusalem." . . . "Then it was, that the 'great judgment' commenced, because then 'the kingdom of the Messiah' took its *open* and *manifested* rise; though, in strict chronology, it is to be dated from the ascension. The 'judgment' and the 'kingdom,' we repeat, cannot be viewed apart from each other. The whole current of ancient prediction represents them as identical; and consequently, as the 'judgment' of the nations, under the figure of the sheep and the goats in the xxvth. of Matthew, comes in immediate connection with the display of 'the coming and kingdom,' that is synchronical with the overthrow of Jerusalem, there is, we confess, no alternative from the conclusion, that that judgment commenced at that time, and has been going on ever since." p. 285, 286.

I here give a synoptical arrangement of the principal texts on this subject.

Kingdom and Reign of the Messiah, or Christ.

- Intratemporal.
  - First coming. In flesh. (Matt. ii. 1, 2; xxi. 5; xxvii. 11.)
  - Second coming.
    - In spirit. (Matt. xix. 28; Acts ii. 36, v. 31; Ephes. ii. 17.)
    - In judgment.
      - Jointly. (Matt. xxv. 31—46; Acts xvii. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 25; 2 Tim. iv. 1.)
      - Severally
        - On the Jews. (Matt. xxiv. 3; Luke xxi. 22—24; 1 Pet. iv. 17.)
        - On the Gentiles. (Dan. ii. 34, 35, 45—; vii. 11, 12, 26.)

Dan. xii. 5—7; Rev. x. 5—7.

Extratemporal. (1 Cor xv. 28; Dan. vii. 27.)

TRUE CHRISTIANITY A PRACTICAL RELIGION.

ARTICLE II.

In our last article (March No. p. 52), we concluded by taking notice of the apparent insufficiency of the sanctions and influences afforded by true Christianity, proposing next to direct our attention to the elucidation of the causes of these. Before entering upon the direct consideration of this subject however, we think it advisable, as a preliminary, to take a glance at the history of God's procedure towards the human race, with special reference to its practical bearing, or its influence on human conduct.

God at first revealed himself to man as a lawgiver, judge, and executioner, in the transactions in Paradise. According to the Scriptural account he imposed upon Adam only one law or command in the form of a prohibition, accompanied with the threat of the punishment of death as the consequence of disobedience; and, when the transgression took place, he summoned him to his bar, condemned him, and sentenced him to die. Now, putting human speculations out of view, let us see what may be fairly and clearly deduced from the scriptural narrative. It is obvious that the Creator by blessing the man, giving him the earth for his habitation and its produce for food, giving him dominion over the animal world, and making and bringing him a wife, gave him a high display of his wisdom, power, and goodness or bounty. But this was only a partial manifestation of his character; for we find that the tempter suggested that God had arbitrarily, perhaps illiberally or jealously, withheld good things from him,—things which he might get possession of by his own act. The spirit of independence suggested doubts of God's goodness while it stimulated desire, its statements were believed and God's discredited, and the prohibited act was committed. Man had yet to be taught that his Creator was just and faithful, and the results of his transgression gave him painful evidence that his ruler was Almighty, and that his commands were not to be treated with impunity.

But God had yet higher attributes to reveal, and these proceedings were only preliminary steps to the manifestation of his true nature; for then, in pronouncing the sentence, he gave the first indication of a Deliverer from evil, and in so doing sowed the first seed of faith, shed the first ray of hope, and kindled the first spark of love, which were destined ultimately to supersede that fear of punishment, which while it partially displayed the attributes, yet veiled the character, of the Creator.

During the period that followed this, we have little information of the nature and extent of God's communications with men: we have reason to believe however that he gave them sufficiently distinct indications of his will for their guidance. Men had then come to know good and evil; acceptance was declared to be the result of doing well, guilt or sin to be incurred by the reverse. They were thus under law. Long-lived and speaking a common language, they were placed in circumstances favourable to the most complete development of their powers

and propensities, and a corresponding manifestation of their nature. But instead of retaining what knowledge of God they had imparted to them and the reverence due to him, the recorded result is that the wickedness of man was great upon the earth, that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually, and that all flesh had corrupted God's way upon the earth. God's vengeance came upon them: the flood came and swept them all away.

Yet human nature remained unaltered. Notwithstanding the new covenant that was made with Noah, the additional display of God's truthfulness and forbearance which is afforded in giving man the animal kingdom also as a source of food, and the promise of never again destroying the world by a flood, men began again to exalt themselves and to forget him to whom they owed everything. If their wickedness did not in earlier times, or has not since, equalled that of the antediluvian world, it is probably due only to the circumstance that the Almighty in his wisdom shortened their lives, confounded their language, and scattered them abroad over the face of the earth, as well as to the light they may have derived from those special revelations of his mind and will which God has at various times been pleased to make.

First, after the original hint of a Deliverer, we find the glad tidings announced to Abraham in the promise that in his seed all nations of the earth should be blessed. And subsequently, we find Moses called to carry forth the seed of Abraham after the flesh out of the land of bondage, leaving them the promise of the Prophet whom the Lord should raise up unto them, to whom they should hearken. And again we see the same great one promised as he who should sit on the throne of his father David for ever, and again as God's servant, his elect, who was to proclaim liberty to the captives and the opening of the prison to them that are bound. These were promises followed by practical results in those to whom they were made and by whom they were believed. We have the results stated in the inspired record, in the 11th chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews, of those Old Testament prophets and captains, "who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness," &c.— "were stoned, were sawn asunder," &c., "being destitute, afflicted, tormented; (of whom the world was not worthy:) who wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in caves of the earth." These deeds they did, those sufferings they underwent, under the influence of that faith which is the confidence of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. They often stood alone, unsupported by their fellow countrymen, unsympathised with in their undertakings, uncompanioned in their sufferings. But they were witnesses for the truth, and were conscious of their high vocation. No selfish hope prompted them, no degrading fear impelled them: the God of Israel had spoken; in his wisdom and goodness and power they had perfect confidence; they unhesitatingly believed that he ever watched over his people, and when his will was expressed they knew that their part was but to act in accordance with that expression, whether it was to do or to suffer. The event lay with their God; and, when they remembered that he was that Jehovah who had brought their fathers out of Egypt with a strong hand and an outstretched arm, they never doubted as to its accomplishment.

Such and so great was the faith of the saints of old in the word of

God, though his character was then but partially manifested, his true purposes with respect to man yet unveiled. So was it exhibited in the last of these prophets, who gave evidence of the practical tendency of his faith by boldly reproving for his evil deeds the tyrant, who consequently imprisoned him and put him to death. And he also, in proclaiming the advent of the Messiah, warned his hearers of the impending wrath, and exhorted them to bring forth fruits meet for repentance: his message was adapted to arouse the attention of his hearers and to influence their conduct.

And when He came to earth who was the object of the faith, hope, and love of the Old Testament saints, his arrival was announced as good tidings of great joy which should be to all people. And when his work was finished, and he had ascended into heaven, his apostles proclaimed him to their countrymen as the long-expected Messiah; and announced to them remission of sins through his name, to all who believed on him, warning them of the condemnation accompanying his rejection. They proclaimed him not only to their countrymen, but extended their joyful message to the Gentiles, shewing that God's love extended to all. And we see the effect of their preaching in the results recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, how that their hearers gladly received their word, praising God for it, associating themselves together for mutual support and edification, and attending stedfastly to the doctrine and ordinances of their teachers. The effects of the Gospel on those who believed it were then exhibited as eminently practical; and to the world was again displayed, and on a wider scale, the fruits of faith in the members of the church of God; in the labours of zeal, and works of love, and patience under sufferings, and forbearance under calumnies, and firmness under trials, which extorted the admiration of their persecutors, and gave evidence that they were followers of him, who, when he suffered committed himself unto him who judgeth righteously, and who exhorted his disciples to rejoice and be exceeding glad when they were exposed to sufferings for his sake.

The full developement of the gospel took place when the Jewish economy was brought to an end and the apostolic testimony ceased to be proclaimed in the form of a command to be believed. Then every vestige of conditionality disappeared, and the full record of the Divine procedure toward man was left to him as a Testament, from which he might learn the character of God as revealed in Jesus Christ.

Then was displayed the full contrast between the Old and New Covenants. In the one there was an exhibition of God's goodness in his bountifully conferring blessings upon man, not to be withdrawn except as the result of his own disobedience; in the other a much higher manifestation in his mercifully bestowing greater blessings unconditionally, as the consequence of the obedience of another. In the one we see the means of stimulating in man the feeling of self-dependence, in the other of shewing him his entire dependence upon God. Though to us the display of God's goodness to man at his creation appears great, it may not have been so to Adam; the feelings suggested to him by the prohibition, that it depended upon himself to keep what he had got, along with his ignorance of good and evil, would rather produce, in a mind essentially selfish, feelings of indifference towards his Creator.

If the enjoyment of the good things which he had were in any way connected with the continuance of his life, the original possession of them might have been as essentially connected with his coming into existence: he might have thought so, or rather he could not have entertained an opposite opinion. If he had no positive feeling that he deserved to get them, he must have been equally destitute of any positive feeling that he could not claim them; the sense of their entire gratuitousness could not have presented itself to his mind: to the consciousness of merit or demerit he must have been equally a stranger. He was thus ignorant of the infinite distance between God and himself; and his ambition, when stimulated, prompted him to be as God. His faith, hope, and love, were principally directed toward himself; toward God the event shewed they were but feeble. Fear, which had been originally suggested to man by the first command, was to become the ruling principle; and has ever since been cultivated and cherished by him as the most efficient means of controlling his fellow creatures and influencing their conduct.

In beautiful contrast with this, stands the second covenant; its unconditionality is manifest in its first hint, when God, in pronouncing sentence against the serpent, said, respecting the seed of the woman, "*it shall bruise thy head.*" The whole reign of law subsequently shewed man's inability to avoid sin,—to preserve himself from destruction; and the progressive manifestation of the new covenant was to display more and more the character of the Deliverer, as he was successively promised as the Father of a nation, a Prophet, a King, and, least of all understood, a Priest who was to make his soul an offering for sin. The whole tendency of the new covenant was to shew man's total dependance upon God, to display God's undeserved beneficence to man, to suggest feelings the very opposite of those of the former dispensation, and to inspire principles of action the very reverse: instead of the hope and fear of what may be apprehended from a righteous and almighty judge, to substitute the gratitude and filial confidence arising from the knowledge of God's character as Love and his relation to them as a Father. If such feelings and principles do not exist in the minds of any who profess belief in the testimony from which they spring, it is to be feared that, however fair or positive their profession, they are labouring under some misunderstanding or imperfect apprehension of its meaning, deceiving themselves, and rejoicing in a lie. To the detection and exposure of these we shall direct our endeavours in our next article: to fulfil, as we may be able, our proposal to elucidate the causes of the apparent insufficiency of the sanctions and influence of true Christianity.

D. W.

THE PADDLE-BOX:

OR, A SCENE ON BOARD A STEAM VESSEL, DURING THE LATE STORM IN ST. GEORGE'S CHANNEL.

Our characters and principles are sure to be tried by the events and circumstances of our existence. It is therefore always instructive and interesting to learn how our brother men conduct themselves under peculiar severity of trial;

and a scene on board one of the steamers of that eventful and melancholy night, in which the Royal Adelaide and so many gallant vessels foundered, having come to my knowledge, I am desirous of communicating the same, with a few reflections that have arisen in my mind in consequence.

A friend of mine was passenger on that night, in a splendid steamer, bound from Belfast to Fleetwood. The storm at one time was so severe, that she was for several hours, though propelled by powerful engines, only able to keep the vessel's head to wind, without making any way whatever. The sea was running mountains; the commander, his officers and sailors, lashed to the vessel, drenched by the repeated waves that swept the deck; and, though long accustomed to the navigation of St. George's Channel, they had never before experienced a storm of such severity. The passengers below were praying to our Father for his merciful interposition. All that skill and daring could accomplish for the vessel's safety had taken place; and the intrepid commander now depended, under God, on the excellence of his engines to keep the vessel to the wind: for, well knowing that, should they give way, the boat would put off into the trough of the sea and inevitably founder, he stood unmoved, inspiring all with confidence.

It is an edifying spectacle to contemplate our brother man steady and composed in the discharge of duty, when the exigency is so tremendous. It is a moment when all hearts beat high, and every ear is open to listen, and, if possible, to respond to the call of duty. Duty, at such seasons, is often a stern mistress; and requires obedience that makes the stoutest heart to quail. And so it happened at this juncture. The look-out passed the word aft, "The starboard signal light is out." Now, my lads, whose heart can rise to this exploit, and mount the paddle-box, over which the sea is streaming a constant flood, the wind in its fiercest fury relentlessly howling? "The light is out." Well, it cannot be helped: it is a great misfortune: they never come alone. Yes: so say timidity and despondency; not so, he whose heart is awake to duty. Duty says the ocean is filled, this night, with vessels scudding before the tempest; and, if the light is not replaced, one of them may run our boat down. The right person's heart was equal to the right response and action. The chief officer of the vessel was that man, and well he showed himself a man and a sailor. He stepped forward with a rope round his waist, and resolutely demanded of the others to hold him fast; and, should he fall overboard, to haul him on board again. He mounted the paddle-box, seized and unshipped the signal lantern; which no sooner accomplished, than a wave swept him and lantern in a flood upon the deck. On the rolling of the vessel the water subsided, when he rose, with the lantern in his hand, to the admiration of all; which, with nautical cheerfulness and jocularity, he modestly averted, by exclaiming, "Oh, what would my poor mother say, if she had seen all this!" More remained to be done, and this undaunted spirit was ready to accomplish what he had undertaken. No sooner was the signal trimmed and lighted, than he again mounted the paddle-box, and replaced the signal light. By the deeds of these men, which may well be styled true self-sacrifice to the calls of duty, the ship was saved. Well might the apostle in the storm, though under direct revelation from heaven of safety, give heaven's high approval to such conduct. "Except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved."

Let us now go below, and with my friend see how it fares with the passengers. They are at prayers: an act that testifies in itself all we could wish under their circumstances. Prayer is confident access to God as our Father. It is the occasion in which the soul of the child rises, in hallowed reverence and submission to his Father's will; and realizes that all his dispensations are right, that they are all advancing us toward our Father's house of many mansions, and the sweet assurance of such a prospect, the earnest of such an inheritance, the amazing love displayed by our Father in the redemption that is in Christ the Lord, the gift of the same Spirit that dwelt in Jesus now dwelling in us, is perfect love, which casteth out every fear that hath torment. So, whether the reconciled praying child of God be in perils on the deep, or the sorrows of sickness and of death, this hope casts a heavenliness about his conduct; because he "still hopes in God."

The passengers are at prayers; but our friend finds them in great alarm. To their natural and very proper enquiries regarding the vessel, her position, and degree of danger, proper and appropriate replies are given. Our friend has, in common with all our brother men, an instinctive dislike to the peculiar termination of this life with which they are threatened. To topple over in a steam-boat on a rough and stormy night, and go to the bottom of St. George's Channel, instead of landing next morning on the shores of old merry England, is not exactly the departure any of us would covet. Still our friend very justly remonstrated with our passengers. He justly concluded, that these exhibitions of terror evidenced some very unworthy and mistaken notions of the character of our Father; and he observed to them, I am in a similar position to yourselves, and have frequently, during my sea-faring life, been in like and in greater dangers; but I never remember having such fearful apprehensions of death as you are exhibiting. But this I must say, that I have observed that religious people always make more ado about dying than other men.

Our friend's reproof and testimony were both true and appropriate. There are great beauty and instruction in this story. The contrast of the scene on deck, and the scene in the cabin, is very illustrative of the excellences and the defects of humanity. Let us cast a thought on this. The scene on deck was stirring active duty, that looked danger in the face, and met every rising occasion with noble and heroic effort. It shows what that nature is capable of, how noble and how good it is. But what we have to ask is, Was the noble service thus performed animated by the apostolic principle, "Whatsoever ye do in word or deed," even mounting a paddle-box in a storm, "do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father through him?" If done in ignorance, or in neglect of his salvation, while the ability of the service shows the nobleness of our nature, yet, without this higher object it is nothing.

One word at parting with our friends at prayer in the cabin. They acknowledge the apostolic precept, they know it, profess to love it, and to act upon it. At prayer—in what better manner could they be employed? They were also on *their* paddle-box. And yet, methinks, there is a strong contrast between the spirit of our officer and theirs. They ought to have been as confident and as cheerful. In communion with God on the threshold of their Father's house,

surely an earnest of heaven must have been imparted, a happy resignation, "Not our will, but thine be done." All things were theirs, whether life or death: life the opportunity of confiding in their Father, death the appointed door to their Father's house. Yes: but orthodoxy was there, and they were miserable sinners; they were "unbelieving believers;" they knew not whether they were their Father's disobedient children. This uncertainty leads us the more anxiously to desire to lift our trumpet, to let all men see what a Father they have; so that, in passing through this world of storms and trials, they may not have to contend with them without the comfort of knowing Him, "in whom they live, and move, and have their being: for they also are His offspring." The nature in which they are now clothed is indeed, in comparison with that with which the human soul shall be clothed in the heavenly world, a "vile body," or more correctly, a "body of humiliation;" yet, let us acknowledge the beauty of our Father's works, and not libel that nature so capable of the great and the noble. Orthodoxy does this: and it is well to take occasion to testify against this cursed perversion of truth; for it has blinded both saints and sinners from seeing how blessed their Father, their Saviour, their all in all is, in all His dealings with us. He is reconciling the world unto Himself. Standing on the threshold of heaven or of hell, fear that hath torment, ay, endless torments, is the fruit of orthodoxy. By their fruits ye shall know them, says the Lord. Does it require any further observation to discover orthodoxy to be on a par with a heathen superstition; and that it never came down from our Father who is in heaven?

PAROIKOS.

Summary of "An Inquiry into the Nature, Progress, and End of Prophecy. By Samuel Lee, D.D. London: *Seeley, Fleet Street.* 1849."

(*Concluded from page* 118.)

BOOK III.

AN EXPOSITION OF THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN.

Chapter I.—On the warnings given to the seven churches of Asia.

In this book we have a revelation of things, that were shortly to come to pass. Jerusalem had not yet fallen; and Domitian, who banished John to Patmos, did not come into full power before that event. The apostle's present is clearly not our present; and it may yet appear that his future is our past. The expression therefore, "I come quickly" refers to the Lord's coming to judgment on that city and polity; and not to us a yet future event, or such announcement ought to have been intimated by "I come again quickly." It has never been promulgated, that this coming to Jerusalem was a personal manifestation on the part of the Lord; nor does the expression, "coming in the clouds of heaven," warrant the idea of such a manifestation to the bodily senses of mankind. The following Scriptures in which a manifestation by clouds is introduced, certainly do not give authority for such an exposition. Dan. vii. 13, speaks of a coming in clouds in the invisible heavens. Matt. xxvi. 64, gives an assurance to Pilate that he was to see this manifestation; which was fulfilled at the judgment on Jerusalem, and the establishment of the church of the first-born, and of the heavenly in the place of the earthly Sion. Exodus xiii. 21, God leads his people in a cloud, but no personal manifestation. Is. iv. 5, xix. 1;

Deut. xxxi. 15; Ps. lxviii. 9—19, civ. 3; Nahum i. 3. None of these manifestations of Christ involve a personal bodily appearance.

Before entering on the exposition of this prophecy, let us refer to a few particulars that may be noticed in the three first chapters.

The explanation of symbols that occur in chap. i. 20, indicate that the book itself supplies every requisite interpretation. Every word of warning to these churches involves a consequence. Vitringa considers the Nicolaitanes identical with the Balaamites, who held the doctrine of the community of women.

The ten days, chap. ii. 10, and the hour of temptation, chap. iii. 10, are identical with Dan. xi. 35, being the time of sorrow of his latter half of the seventieth week, indefinitely as in some days, or Gen. xxiv. 35, a decade: Satan's seat, heathen Rome. Hidden manna, Christ, John vi. 32—36. The white stone has no reference, as usually taught, to the heathen games. The new name on it none other than Christian. Compare Is. lxii. 2, and Acts xi. 26. Also, Deut. vi. 8, seq. and Num. xvii. 2, 3. On a pure white stone, subject to no decay, the name Christian is written: a pillar in the heavenly city, pure, white, and enduring; and so far he is to be a Cephas, or Peter, both as to faith and practice. Under the new covenant, the name Christian includes everything spiritual and heavenly, that is, "I will give him the morning star: my own enlightening Spirit, a gift not limited to the seven churches, but universal. Apostolic Christianity is this. The first intimation that we have of this star is Num. xxiv. 17. Our natural life is forfeited, and is to be raised to spiritual life under Shiloh, to whom shall be the gathering of the people. Luke i. 78, ii. 32; Is. lx. 1, seq.; Mal. iii. 2; Matt. ii. 2. "The beginning of the creation:" the head and sole governor. Prov. viii. 22; Col. i. 15, 16, where πρωτοτοκος should imply *primogenitus*, as to dignity and pre-eminence, rather than any passive sense as to birth.

From these epistles, and indeed from the aspect of the primitive church at its best, we have imperfectly manifested the perfect and heavenly religion of Christ. Blessed is the contemplation of the love of the Holy Spirit in raising man to the likeness of his Lord. It is the raising of the imperfect into the perfect, the earthly into the heavenly, and it is vain to measure a work in progress with a work completed; or the imperfection of the church on earth with the perfect standard of its glory in the heavens. Never has the bride been able to boast of herself, her glorying has always been in her Lord; who loved her and visited her in her lost estate, that he might exalt her to his own dignity, holiness, and heavenly home.

Chapter II.—On the second vision of St. John.

The Opening of the Seals.

Thunderings, lightnings, and voices, are indicative of judgments to be inflicted on the enemies of Christ's church about to be established on the earth. Dr. Lee considers the number of the seals, seven, to be an indefinite number; corresponding with Daniel's seven days of his last or seventieth week; during which the covenant was to be magnified with "*the many*." This number seven then involves the last week, the last days, the end of the world (age).

The new song in chap. v. 9—14, to which such frequent reference is made in the Psalms, Is. xiii. 10, and other places, is now put into our mouths, and becomes our song; because the Son of man is exhibited in heaven, having all power there and on earth. The reign of heaven has come, it is universal and complete: and mankind are to turn from Jewish observances, and heathen superstitions and mistakes; and in spirit and in truth to realize by faith their redemption in Christ, and to worship in the true sanctuary that the Lord has pitched for them in the heavens.

Now turn to chap. vi., while we notice a few leading opinions on the seals; bearing in remembrance that under this revelation of the seals, the Jews are broken off, and are of the synagogue of Satan. Earthly Jerusalem is now the spiritual Sodom; and the Jerusalem that is above is the mother of us all.

The first seal. Read Ps. xlv. and Zech. ix. 12—17. Our Saviour is here revealed in power diffusing divine truth. Judah and Ephraim united, bent as a bow, his arrows shall go forth as the lightning. Matt. xxiv. 27—31. Comp. Is. lxvi. 18—24, where we have Christ going forth conquering and to conquer, with judgment first on the Jew, and then on the unbelieving Gentile. See also Ps. cx. 5—7; Num. xxiv. 8, 9; Deut. xxxii. 19—29; Ezek. v. 12—17; and many other similar passages in the Prophets and the Psalms, that evidently refer to this period. The revelation of our Lord, in all these Scriptures, does in no wise authorise the idea of a personal appearance: it unanimously testifies to an appearance in power by his ministers; in nature, by the thunder and lightning, the pestilence and famine; in the church, by his apostles, their associates and coadjutors, as taken out of the remnant of Israel. By these does the Saviour appear, and by them does he govern the nations of the earth. Zech. viii. 11—13.

This first seal is but an echo of Zech. i. 8—12, including indeed the others also. The red horse, the minister of judgment, standing among the myrtle trees, the emblem of the church of God. Is. xli. 19, lv. 15. In Zech. i. 12, we have seventy years again, marking the period, the punishment of Jew and Gentile, and the establishment of the heavenly Jerusalem. The four chariots we are told have quieted or reconciled the world by their ministry, which are Christ's ministers to the four quarters of the world. Thus the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy, and the denial of him the spirit of evil. See then, in this first seal, Christ and his apostles going forth to establish his kingdom by his word and presence.

The second seal. Rev. vi. 4. Comp. Matt. x. 34, and Luke xii. 49—53. The great sword of the new covenant is the word of God, or breath of his lips. Is. xi. 4. The time of this seal is supposed by Dr. Lee to be the command of the apostolic ministry previous to the fall of Jerusalem. Its being red applies to the blood of apostles and martyrs; Stephen, James, Antipas, &c. Acts xxvi. 10, 11.

Third seal. Rev. vi. 5, 6. Black is the emblem of darkness. By the balances seems to be meant that it was the office of this minister to weigh the sinful state of the world—that for which the church at Ephesus was commended. Rev. ii. 2. The consequence of the earth's being weighed was a dearth, which may comprehend those foretold by Agabus, Acts xii. and Matt. xxiv. 7. In A. D. 23, a grievous famine, that lasted two years, occurred. The interdiction not to touch the oil and wine is equivalent to, Inflict no injury on my vineyard. Rev. vii. 3, are the holy remnant, who are afterwards found upon mount Zion. Rev. xiv. 1. This seal falls within the first half of Daniel's last week of his seventy. The end is not come yet; for there are four more seals to open.

Fourth seal. Rev. vi. 7, 8. On the ground that these seven seals correspond with the last days of Daniel's last week, this seal will be the fourth day of the week. We are therefore now beyond the fall of Jerusalem, which took place in the midst of the week; and we are beyond the line which divides this period from that of apostolic preaching. Judgment on those Jews not found to be trees of the Lord's planting, having been weighed by the black horse and found wanting, are now consigned to famine, mourning, and woe. It was during this sad period, this last half of Daniel's week, that the time of trouble such as never was nor again should be, took place, and such an incredible amount of destruction in the habitable parts of the earth, as already referred to.

Fifth seal. Rev. vi. 9—11. Under this seal, a continuation of the judgments commenced under the last, is poured out on the little horn. In explanation of its time and doctrine, the following Scriptures must be consulted. Dan. xii. 1, 6, 7; Rev. xiii. 5. This is the 1260 days, or three and a half years, or the time times and a half, or the forty-two months, which are all identical. The little season of Rev. xx. 3, is the same; and the next verse (4) informs us of "the judgment given," which is that foretold Dan. vii. 9, 11. See also v. 26, 27. This little season is Daniel's last half of his last 70th week. The first resurrec-

tion, the first fruits to God and to the Lamb; and the 1000 years, the indefinite time of the apostolic church, when they exercised such authority over every power of the enemy, that the strong man now bound could no longer keep his house and goods in peace. Matt. xii. 29. That day of the Lord dissolved the elementary systems of this world's superstitions; and a new heaven and a new earth, not the physical, but the moral, arose in the spiritual and heavenly worship established on earth.

Sixth seal. Rev. vi. 12, to the end of chap. vii. This terminates Daniel's seventieth week, in which, by the judgments here denounced, a great moral and religious revolution is brought about. The heavenly bodies, formerly worshipped, lose their lustre; kings and mighty men discover their gods to be nothing; and flee from the face of him who now arose to shake terribly the earth. The Lord's words are, "the powers of heaven shall be shaken," or lose their influence.

The first and second chapters of Joel are, on the authority of St. Peter, Acts ii. 16, declared to be applicable to apostolic times; and in chap. iii. 18, we have the blessings of the new covenant as known and felt among the heathen. See Is. xxxiv. By the everlasting duration of these judgments, we are necessarily to understand that no restoration of the heathen domination should ever take place. The next chapter brings us, like Joel, to new covenant days. Compare in this light, Rev. vi. 15, to the end, and Is. ii. 19—22. Also, Hos. x. 8; Is. xiii, xiv. 1—7, xxiv, xxv, and xxvi.

In Rev. vii. 1, and Dan. vii. 2, we find the winds of heaven restrained until something further was done; and then the four empires arise, the agitation begins. In Rev. we have 144,000 secured against their power; and in Dan. vii. 10, a fiery stream issues from before the judge; and then heathen Rome, the little horn, is given to the burning flame, or the judgments of the sixth seal. The Son of man then takes possession of the kingdom; and then, according to Dan. vii. 28, is the end of the matter. The same truth comes out also from the sixth trumpet.

The prototype of this sealing is found in Ezek. ix. 4, seq. in the remnant who sigh for the existing abomination. Compare 1 Pet. iv. 17, with 2 Pet. iii, where he appears to speak of both judgments in the very words of the prophet, and to determine that they were about to take place in his days. So in Ezek. xxviii, and James i. 18, we find these first fruits, or the 144,000, the remnant, the elect, the church of the first-born. Heb. xii. 22; Is. lxv. 16.

Victory is completed on the opening of six of the seven seals. The remnant from every tribe rejoice with an innumerable company. In their hands they hold palms, emblems of peace with God and man, and they sing praises as having come out of the great tribulation. All this is a scene on earth: the tribulation here, Dan. ix. 26, 27; the new song here, Ps. xxxiii. Read their position, Rev. vii. 13, to the end of the chapter. Their clothing, their condition of day and night in a temple; God dwelling with them, not they with God; hunger, thirst, sun, heat, and tears, are all earthly things. The Lamb doing the things ascribed to him in heaven would be out of place: it is his presence here that causes his children to rejoice in tribulation; and it is his kind hand that now wipes the sorrowful tear, and can alone make men happy. The victory of the church over the world: the old heathen or moral rule of the Roman world now disappeared, and all becomes new. In six days and six seals the heavenly change was accomplished: the new dispensation established. On the opening of the seventh seal we read, "It is done." The seven trumpets and the seven vials teach and echo the same conflict in judgment, and the same deliverance in victory. The assembly of the redeemed now have their Sabbath service of praise, when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy.

The half hour's silence marks the close of the seven seals; giving space for the sounding of the seven trumpets, that they should not be confounded, though

they are but repetitions of the seals, just as we find the same predicted events in the visions of the prophet Daniel.

* * * * * * * *

Our limits forbid our following the learned Doctor any farther. In a few of his observations we might be disposed to differ; but it is so refreshing, in these days, to forget difference if possible, and to rejoice together in bringing out any truth from the confusion of our interpretations, that we are happy to leave differences unnoticed; hoping that the light of truth will yet enlighten and convince beloved Christian brethren, who interpret expressions of Scripture as if death, which has been destroyed, could possibly be "Eternal;" or punishment, which is a means to an end, could be endless.

"The subject," says our author, (whose work we have so imperfectly exhibited, but which we so cordially recommend,) "is not followed out to the extent, or with the accuracy it deserves; but I have perhaps succeeded in pointing out principles of interpretation which are good, and have in the main made Scripture its own interpreter"—and he concludes in what we fully sympathise by saying, "I feel, in sending it forth, something like the regrets experienced in parting with a long-endeared friend; but, as I trust it will now supply a similar pleasure to many, I do not so greatly lament over the parting farewell."

PAROIKOS.

POETRY.

A WORD TO THE "ELECT."

You may rejoice to think *yourselves* secure;
You may be grateful for the gift divine—
That grace unsought, which made your black hearts pure,
And fits your earth-born souls in Heaven to shine.

But, is it sweet to look around and view
Thousands excluded from that happiness
Which they deserved at least as much as you—
Their faults not greater, nor their virtues less?

And, wherefore should you love your God the more,
Because to you alone his smiles are given;
Because he chose to pass the *many* o'er,
And only bring the favoured *few* to Heaven?

And, wherefore should your hearts more grateful prove,
Because for ALL the Saviour did not die?
Is yours the God of justice and of love?
And are your bosoms warm with charity?

Say, does your heart expand to all mankind?
And, would you ever to your neighbour do—
The weak, the strong, the enlightened, and the blind—
As you would have your neighbour do to you?

And, when you, looking on your fellow men,
Behold them doomed to endless misery,
How can you talk of joy and rapture then?—
May God withhold such cruel joy from me!

That none deserve eternal bliss I know;
Unmerited the grace in mercy given:
But, none shall sink to everlasting woe,
That have not well deserved the wrath of Heaven.

And, oh! there lives within my heart
A hope, long nursed by me;
(And, should its cheering ray depart,
How dark my soul would be!)

That as in Adam all have died,
In Christ shall all men live;
And ever round his throne abide,
Eternal praise to give.

ACTON BELL.

REVIEWS.

THREE QUESTIONS PROPOSED AND ANSWERED, CONCERNING THE LIFE FORFEITED BY ADAM, THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD, AND ETERNAL PUNISHMENT. By DAVID THOM, D. D. Ph. D. Third Edition: being Vol. II. of the Universalist's Library. *London: H. K. Lewis. Boston, U.S.: A. C. Tomkins.* 1849.

THE first edition of the work before us was published in 1828. Subsequently to this, the author informs us, his views experienced considerable correction

and enlargement on the topics of which it treats; which were embodied in a second edition, published in 1835. The present edition is a reprint of the second, with a few alterations and additions, chiefly in the form of notes.

The questions proposed for consideration, which are rightly stated to be of the last importance, are—

"I. What was the death threatened to and incurred by Adam, as the consequence and punishment of his first transgression?"

"II. What is the cause of the resurrection of the dead?"

"III. Is there any authority in Scripture, or in reasonings legitimately derived from Scripture, for the ordinary doctrine of the eternal punishment, in the sense of eternal torments of the wicked, in a state of existence succeeding the present?"

These questions are discussed fully, searchingly, and logically, examined in their various bearings, and answered distinctly. The questions are considered in various points of view: the popular opinions on the subject are analysed, sifted, and tried by Scripture, their fallacies exposed, and their insufficiency demonstrated. The grounds for the answers are sought for in Scriptural statements; these are cleared from the erroneous and hasty inferences drawn from them by those influenced by preconceived notions on the subject; and the answers given, with the reasons for and inferences from them, are such as the author believes are only fairly and strictly deducible from the data furnished by the word of God, to which he appeals as the only authority competent to decide. These answers are as follows:—

1st. "The death which was threatened to Adam, and which was incurred by him in consequence of transgression, was the immediate loss of creature righteousness or life of the natural mind; and immediate liability to the loss of the life of the natural body, followed in process of time by the actual loss of that life.

2nd. "The cause of the resurrection of human beings is, not any natural immortality of which they are possessed, but the resurrection of the Lord Jesus from the dead."

3rd. "There is no authority either in Scripture, or in reasonings legitimately derived from Scripture, for the ordinary doctrine of eternal punishment hereafter."

Some "additional and explanatory remarks," to obviate some general objections, and a "conclusion," complete the work.

It is almost unnecessary for us to speak of the manner in which our author executes his task. He has been so long before the public, as the leading writer in this country on the subject of Universal Salvation, that his talents, genius, and abilities as a controversialist, must be well known to the generality of the readers of this magazine. For those however who may be less acquainted with his writings we may say, that from this, the least voluminous of his productions, they will find throughout evidence of qualifications, which well entitle him to the place we have given him as the most influential advocate of Universalist principles in this country; in the acuteness, penetration, and discrimination, which so well enable him to detect the weaknesses and expose the fallacies of his opponents; in the powers of reasoning, abstraction, and comparison, which give him so great ability in analysing the positions of his antagonists, and of placing his own clearly before the reader; and in the genius which does more than detect error, by laying hold on truth in circumstances in which ordinary minds would find themselves at fault, either remaining in ignorance, or contenting themselves with the adoption of some other error, perhaps somewhat less exposed to charges of inconsistency than that they have rejected.

But we shall better enable our readers to form a judgment for themselves by giving a sketch of the way in which the subject is treated; and, for this purpose, we shall select the second question, chiefly on account of its being discussed at the shortest length. In considering it—What is the cause of the resurrection of the dead? our author assumes that the resurrection of the dead is a fact,

which cannot be controverted by those who give credit to the testimony of Scripture. He also admits that the grand originating cause is the will of the Supreme Being; but the matter for investigation is the proximate or instrumental cause—"the medium or channel through which God accomplishes his purpose that the dead shall rise again." This enquiry resolves itself into two parts:—First, "Do the dead rise again in virtue of connection with Adam or with the Lord Jesus?" Not with Adam, because, 1. Adam is uniformly represented and spoken of in Scripture, as the author and source of *death:* 2. If the eternal life or immortality to which the dead are raised be the divine nature, Adam cannot be the source, origin, or author of the one without being in the same relation to the other—the source of the divine nature, which is impossible: 3. If Adam be the source of the resurrection of the dead, the declarations of the Lord Jesus concerning himself are expressly contradicted. Moreover, even supposing Adam originally possessed spiritual and eternal life, he forfeited it by his transgression, and all his posterity begotten since never inherited it. And it follows that if he could thus lose it, and immortality flow to men only through Jesus Christ, there is no foundation for the common doctrine of the immortality of the soul.

Secondly. If the dead rise "in virtue of a connection with the Lord Jesus, in what particular way is this glorious consummation accomplished?" *Answer*—Through an inseparable connection with his resurrection; proved, 1. Negatively: were it not so, then is the resurrection of the Lord Jesus an event of, comparatively speaking, subordinate importance; 2. Positively: by a reference to Scripture testimonies to that effect, embracing the language of Jesus himself, as in John xiv. 2—4, 19; the preaching of the apostles, as in Acts iv. 2; and the language of the epistles, as in 1 Cor. xv. 12—33. The author then, after charging the supporters of the ordinary doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul with certain untenable consequences, and guarding his readers against misunderstanding his own sentiments on the subject, concludes the section by giving the answer to the question, with the chief reason for it, and the inference from it.

In the consideration of the third question the author indicates *his* view of eternal punishment, and of its compatibility with universal salvation. And the statement of this will afford us an opportunity of giving a specimen of his style. He says, p. 125, "Two intelligent beings are in Scripture set before us, Adam and Christ. Each of these has a nature essentially distinguished from that of the other; and in the nature of each of them immense numbers participate. The nature of the former is *creaturely* and *wicked;* the nature of the latter is *divine* and *righteous.* The nature of the former, as essentially and necessarily wicked, is *everlastingly punished* by being *everlastingly destroyed;* the nature of the latter, as essentially and necessarily righteous, is *necessarily connected with everlasting existence.* But those who partake of the nature of the former are, in one way or another, and at one period or another, destined also to partake of the nature of the latter. Hence it happens, that every intelligent being, and the whole body of intelligent beings, are presented to us in the sacred writings under a twofold aspect. As Adam's descendants they are originally *wicked,* and *as such* are subjected to *everlasting punishment;* but as Christ's descendants, they are made *partakers* of *the divine nature,* and *as such live for ever.* And the connection between *Adam's nature* and *Christ's nature,* through which this wonderful transformation is effected, takes place, in consequence of God himself having assumed and been made manifest in flesh; and in consequence of His communicating to the minds of a certain number of the human race, even while in the flesh, the first fruits of the divine nature."

We have thus given a brief sketch of the system contended for in this work, but must refer the reader to the volume itself for the details. We cannot however take leave of it without adverting to some points in which we think it exhibits defects, or lies open to objections. These arise principally from the author's tendency to system making, and to the adoption of views and use of

language in accordance with and adapted to his systems. Such doctrines and phrases as those of believers being "one with God," and "partakers of the divine nature," are prominent examples of this. The author asserts that he has the authority of Scripture for the former expression in John xiv. 21—23: the words occur in the prayer of Jesus for his disciples, "that they may be one, even as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they may be one in us." The Scriptural expression of the body of believers being one in God, does not convey to our minds the same meaning as the author's phrase of each or every believer being one with God. It may also be questioned if the expression in 2 Pet. i. 4—"partakers of the divine nature" warrants the general use of it made by this writer: we rather think that the meaning attached to it, in the work under review, is not always the same as that in the apostolic epistle; but as the investigation of this subject would occupy greater space than our limits admit of, we shall for the present forego it.

We cannot however overlook one passage, in which this tendency to construct and defend a system, comes out in a very objectionable manner, the more so as it is quite uncalled for. We allude to a passage commencing page 117, in noticing an objection to the system now proposed, "that little infants cannot believe, and must therefore be excluded from heavenly blessings, that is, from the kingdom of Christ and of God, enjoyed by believers of the gospel." In regard to this subject he says, "I was for a long time exceedingly puzzled. Faith, I clearly saw, was competent only to adults, &c." and in going on to show how the difficulty was removed, he continues, "Faith, I had long observed, was represented as *working by love*; but love, or the divine nature, it was not till recently given me to observe distinctly, is itself the root of faith. *Love believeth all things*, 1 Cor. xiii. 7;" a statement, in our apprehension, having little further connection with the point attempted to be proved than that the words love and believe occur in it. And he further quotes, most inappropriately, 1 John iv. 19, "we love him because he first loved us." We admit most readily that love is the root of faith, namely, that God's love is the source of man's faith, for faith is the gift of God. But we also as decidedly maintain that, in man, faith is the source of love; and we could not adduce a better proof of this than the last quotation from John's epistle, which exhibits love in believers as springing from their knowledge of God's love to them: the meaning which we understand to be indicated by the whole of the New Testament Scriptures, for an abstract of which we need go no farther than this very 4th chapter of 1st John, from the 7th verse downwards.

The author proceeds—"What then, it struck me, is essential to the possession of an interest in Christ's kingdom hereafter, on the part of any human being while here, is not, properly speaking, faith *which is merely an effect*, but love or the divine nature *which of every grace is the cause*. Of the former the infant is certainly incapable; but not of the latter." Well then, to this we reply, that if love or the divine nature, as our author is so fond of saying, be only communicated to man through the manifestation to him of God's character in the work of Jesus Christ, by his belief of the testimony which tells of that work, and this we believe to be the only Scriptural doctrine, then we say most decidedly that infants are totally incapable of possessing that love. Then, after some idle "supposings," and equally idle questions as to what is to prevent God from doing so and so, the author winds up his arguments thus, "No doubt in adults the divine nature will indicate its existence by faith; that is, by their bringing forth an effect corresponding to the principle of which they are possessed: but faith, as an effect, is merely *an accident*; it is love which, as the cause, is *the essence*; and if love be conferred, is not the divine nature, and thereby the capacity for admission into Christ's kingdom, conferred likewise?" Faith, as an effect, merely an accident; for this we have quoted 1 Cor. xiii. especially ver. 13—"And now abideth faith, hope, and charity, these three, but the greatest of these is charity," or love. Well, it is so, and why? because it is the end and consummation of faith and hope; it will exist when faith shall have been swallowed up in sight, and hope in enjoyment: it is greatest even

now, inasmuch as it is that which gives evidence of the existence of the others, and is the object for which they are given to man. But, so far from being an accident, we maintain that faith is most essential; as an effect of God's love, it is the medium through which both hope and love are communicated; as a cause, it is the only source or fountain of divine love in man. The conclusion of this argument is a worthy consummation of the preceding—"the conferring of the divine nature, and thereby the capacity of admission into Christ's kingdom!" Change the phraseology a little, and we have grace given by the Holy Spirit whereby men are put into a salvable state, or have their hearts changed, whereby they are rendered capable of and inclined to accept of the mercy offered through Christ. Will our author admit this, and if he should not, will he tell us wherein consists the essential difference between the two doctrines? Why should such arguments be limited to the case of infants? Why not extended to the heathen—to all, in nominally Christian countries, who have never been under religious instruction; nay, to all however religiously instructed who have not had the simplicity of the gospel laid before them? Nay, we would ask, what is the use of the apostolic testimony at all?

Some of our readers may possibly think that we have animadverted on this at greater length than necessary. We do not think so; for it embodies in a most glaring form what we conceive to be the most prominent defect of this author's doctrine, or at least of his mode of expounding it: and that is a tendency to a kind of high Calvinism, which makes the gospel consist of a confident persuasion that we especially are children of God, and leads those who adopt it to lose sight of the great truth which the apostolic gospel is adapted to convey—God's hatred of sin, and the greatness of his love manifested in the way in which he saves men from this and its effects, substituting for this some Antinomian and Pharisaical notion, that to sin Jehovah is indifferent and his special favourites are above it. If such can only persuade themselves that they are partakers of the divine nature, they are puffed up with a notion of their own spirituality, and look upon the glad tidings of the death and resurrection of Christ as something of quite subsidiary importance.

We need hardly say that we consider this passage on infant salvation as worse than useless in its tendencies and totally uncalled for. There is not the slightest occasion for being puzzled with the subject of infant salvation; the Scriptures tell us that as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive; and with respect to the special salvation communicated in this life through faith, of course it cannot be communicated to any except those capable of faith. Men may rest assured, that God will regulate all the circumstances necessary for salvation in this life for those whom he is pleased to elect for this purpose—time, place, age, and capacity. We are confident that Dr. Thom would readily admit this, and we cannot think that he really means what the treatment of this subject almost appears to indicate; but rather regards it as the result of intellectual speculation—an example of "darkening counsel by words without knowledge."

Now that we have put our readers on their guard against what we believe to be objectionable in the work, we shall conclude with the more grateful task of commending it strongly to their attention. They will find in it an amount of originality for which they might search in vain hundreds of ordinary religious works; matter which will open a new field of thought to those who are unacquainted with the author's writings; and afford those who are an abundant supply of material for reflection, either by suggesting new ideas, or prompting to the reconsideration of opinions already adopted.

EKDIKALETHES.

Shem, Ham, Japheth; or the Curse and Blessing of Noah Fulfilled in the History of the World. By PETER HATELEY WADDELL, Minister of the Gospel, Girvan.—*London, H. K. Lewis, 15, Gower Street North.*

A lecture, or expository sermon, written and published by Mr. Waddell, of

Girvan, Ayrshire, and bearing the above title, has been put into our hands; and with the perusal of it we have been so much gratified, that a general idea of its contents we feel almost irresistibly impelled to present to our readers.

To call the work now before us a sermon, or even a lecture, is, we submit, rather inappropriate. It indicates more depth of research, takes a wider range, and is less popular in its structure and methods of illustration, than these kinds of composition usually are. Should we speak of it as an essay, bringing under public notice, in a form the most condensed, and yet the most perspicuous, certain Scriptural facts and prophecies of the greatest importance, and pointing out the bearings of these on the past, present, and future history of the world, we think that we should be nearer the mark in designating our author's production, than he himself has been. However, a lecture he has styled it, and a lecture let it be.

The title is, "Ham, Shem, and Japheth; or the curse and blessing of Noah fulfilled in the history of the world." And the discourse itself—what cannot always with truth be asserted—fully justifies its adoption. We have here a brief and Scriptural sketch of the patriarchs Ham, Shem, and Japheth—the three ancestors of the existing human race—and of the doings and progress of their posterity, set before us. Curious have been their respective fates. Truly, in reflecting on the subject, there is suggested to us by it one illustration of our blessed Lord's words: *the last shall be first, and the first last.* Divine Inversion is here embodied in fact. Ham, notwithstanding the curse pronounced on him in the person of Canaan his son, actually, as if to falsify the divine prediction, takes precedence of his brethren, and seems destined to outstrip them in the career of earthly advancement and glory. But by and bye "a change comes o'er the spirit of his dream." Shem steps forward to limit his ambitious designs, to cast him down from his high and palmy state, and to take his place. For a while victory tracks his path, and nothing short of universal empire looms in the distance as his appointed goal. A greater, however, than Ham, or Shem, is in reserve. Japheth, almost unnoticed and unknown, is silently emerging from his pristine state of barbarism—is silently growing up, and silently preparing for the station of eminence and usefulness—the career of glory—which Noah had prophetically announced, and which Jehovah had been preparing for him. At length, he makes his appearance on the world's stage. Arms and conquest pave his way—literature, arts, and science follow in his wake—and by dint of strength of intellect, combined with vigorous but prudent daring,—his whole soul being steeped in an atmosphere of superior morals and religion—his authority is at last acknowledged and consolidated. He is last in the career of civilization and improvement; but in the long run he distances all his competitors. They feel and are constrained to bow to a supremacy, by which they themselves are to profit. Japheth comes forward last in order of time, as he is named the last in the enumeration of Noah's family; but he is destined to prove himself the chief, as he is in reality the first of Noah's descendants—the qualified ruler, as well as benefactor of his brethren.

Such is a very meagre and inadequate outline of the purport of Mr. Waddell's masterly production.

In reading it, notwithstanding many important points of difference, we have been struck by the resemblance which, in not a few respects, it bears to Lord Lindsay's "Progression by Antagonism," a work which, we suspect, Mr. Waddell never saw. Shem, Ham, and Japheth personally, and in their respective posterities; and the early success of Ham, bounded by the rise of Shem, both being rendered subservient to the ultimate glory of Japheth, are topics common to both. Immense is the discrepancy between the treatment of the subject by the two authors. Ability of a high order is displayed by both. Clever and ingenious, however, as the noble Lord's work is—and it is both in no ordinary degree—we prefer to it that of Mr. Waddell. The former is *too* exclusively *phrenological* for us. It is, besides, *crotchety* in some other respects.

That manly sobriety of tone—that bringing down of statements and assumptions to the exact level of Scripture—which characterise Mr. Waddell's production, the other is occasionally destitute of. Still, on account of its intrinsic merits, Lord Lindsay's "Progression by Antagonism," along with Mr. Waddell's "Lecture," we would respectfully recommend to the perusal of our readers; especially to those who cannot command time for the study of larger works. Each of the *brochures* mentioned will be found powerfully suggestive. Divine Inversion, whether understood by their respective authors or not, is the Scriptural doctrine which in reality imparts value to, as it affords the only true explanation of, their researches and speculations.

Ethnology, or that new science which respects the rise, progress, and characteristics of the human race, has long been a favourite topic of study with us. Great was the interest, and not small we trust the profit, with which we perused the long work of the late Dr. Prichard on the History of Man, (five large volumes); and that admirable abstract of it, as well as of kindred books on the same subject, which appeared two or three years since, in the "Edinburgh Review." Delighted are we at the improved tone of thought and language which now pervades speculations of this sort. Time was when Bailly and others seemed almost to gloat over Hindu and Chinese chronology, as tending by their glowing although vague accounts of remote æras, and by their carrying back human civilization thousands of years beyond the flood to subvert and overthrow the authority of the Mosaic records. Subsequent investigations have shown the utter fabulousness of all such pretended annals. The result has been to counteract the infidelity of a former age. Even over minds ignorant of the glorious gospel, and by no means particularly friendly to revelation, something like greater sobriety of thought has recently been drawn. We hail this as a pleasing omen. Prichard, the Coryphæus of modern ethnologists, writes as if increasing discoveries all pointed to one man as the origin of the human race, and to the confusion of tongues at Babel, as the origin of our present diversity of languages. What Prichard suggests indeed implies, productions like that of Mr. Waddell, show most ably, ingeniously, and satisfactorily to be matter of fact. Therefore it is that we congratulate our readers, and the religious public in general, on their appearance.

The tabular view given at the end of the lecture is admirably drawn up, and will be found to be extremely useful.

Is the amiable and excellent author of this work aware, that by the publication of it he is subserving the glorious cause of Universal Salvation? Probably not. Nevertheless, as unintentionally one of our coadjutors, and not one of the least respected, we tender him our heartfelt thanks.

D. T.

The Doctrine of a Future State: in Nine Sermons, preached before the University of Cambridge, in the year MDCCCXLIX. *At the Lecture founded by the Rev. John Hulse, M. A.* By William Gibson Humphrey, B. D. Fellow of Trinity College, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of London. *London, J. W. Parker, West Strand.*

Mr. Humphrey shows himself, in common with most Partialists, to know nothing of the present state of the controversy, by confining his notice to the doctrines of purgatory and annihilation; and by repeating the oft-refuted sense commonly put on Matt. xxv. 46. But, while appealing to this single passage, by which, according to him, "the subject is shut up in a very narrow compass, too narrow as we might suppose, to leave any ground for controversy," he is equally ready to nullify other passages, which he feels to be against him. He says, "it may be as erroneous to attribute to God the virtues of humanity, as as it is to conceive him subject to the emotions, and endowed with the bodily faculties of our nature." p. 213. To what purpose then, are we told, that "God

is love," or that we are called on to imitate his benevolence, if we can form no conception of either? Matt. v. 45. The truth, on the contrary, is, that all that is good or virtuous in man is heaven-derived; (James i. 17) and we think God more honoured by this view of his character, than by such abstractions as would reduce it to a non-entity.

Partialists do not consider, that all we know of God or of his attributes is derived from Revelation; and that arguments founded on these attributes are therefore as Scriptural as any other. Assumptions and cavils!—We wish all who fix these imputations were equally careful to avoid them, and to abstain from the unfair and weak expedient of exciting indiscriminate odium, such as often employed, by the infidels whom they condemn, against Christianity itself. We are not so easily satisfied, or so little solicitous to give satisfaction to others. No—we endeavour to establish our positions by every species of legitimate argument; and think we may fairly refer to our article, in p. 49, for a full answer to this writer.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

Mr. Editor,—I have been struck with the interesting critique of your correspondent "Δ" on the translation of the Greek word "Katargeitai," in the two texts, 1 Cor. xv. 26, and 2 Cor. iii. 14, and beg respectfully to present this brief notice to his Christian attention, in the absence of better information. It may be rather difficult to say *why* the same Hebrew or Greek word should be rendered in so many different English forms, as every scholar must know it is in the what is termed our "authorized version."

But I submit an opinion.—In King James's time there were forty-seven persons employed by him to form a new translation, for the purpose of correcting the glaring errors of which he complained in former versions. His words were, "I have never yet seen a Bible well translated into English," &c. These men were to be taken from the most learned of the universities, and to be divided into five classes, each to have a certain number of the holy books allotted to him for translation: to whom the King gave *fifteen* instructions how they were to act, the *eighth* of which reads thus, "Every particular man of each company to take the same chapter, or chapters; and having translated *or amended* them severally by himself, where he *thinketh* good, all to meet together, to confer what they have done, and agree for their parts what shall stand." Now it must be evident, from this proceeding, that differences of view might arise, and that nothing more than a *general* agreement could result therefrom. *Exactitude* appears to me out of the question. I just mention one simple instance, in a *proper* name, to show this. In Genesis, chapter v, the name *Enoch* is without the *aspirate;* but in 1 Chron. i. 3, it is *aspirated* as in the Hebrew, *Henoch*. This may appear a trifle in a scholar's eye, but a mere plain English Christian, with a tender conscience *(I have known such a case)*, might imagine it was not the same person meant. Here it is worthy to be noted, that it was not the *same* class of translators for *Chronicles* as the *preceding* books. The first *ten* translators were of the *Westminster* class as far as Chronicles *exclusive;* the next *eight* translators, who gave "*Henoch*," were of the *Cambridge* class down to Isaiah *exclusive;* and so the divided portions to the end of the Bible.

I think too it is quite correct to assume that these translators must all be looked at *merely* as to *scholarship;* withot supposing for a moment that, as spiritual and unfettered men, they understood or even thought, of the absolutely *Divine, unique harmony* required throughout the whole word of the *one* mind of its *Divine* author: for had that been the case, they certainly would not have given so many conflicting English forms of the *same* root of words from both the Hebrew and the Greek.

I strongly recommend to every Christian scholar to consider that our translators were as *uninspired* as ourselves, and not better *biblical* scholars than some of us; also to observe the *primary* meaning of every original word, and to examine very carefully the different *secondary* uses of it in the English version; and likewise to pay marked attention to the use of the *Greek* article in the New Testament, ever keeping in mind that a very beautifully simple divine analogy pervades "all the counsel of God." Whilst it is admitted no translation can fully come up to the beauty of the *original*, it is quite possible to translate the Scriptures into another tongue without, in any

case, making scripture *contradict* scripture; and every upright Christian deserves to be commended for endeavouring thus to *harmonize* the word of God.

With Christian love to all who love our blessed Lord Jesus, in his person and all his offices and work,

I am faithfully, a fellow labourer in the truth,
QUALIS AB INCEPTO.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

SIR,—The late learned and excellent Dr. Southey has called Calvinism by the just title of "Diabolism." If he were yet among the living on earth, I feel persuaded that he would hail with joy the appearance of your excellent periodical, and that he would give it his best support.

You have supplied a desideratum, that is, a channel through which the wholesome waters of eternal life and universal salvation may freely flow.

You have taken away the reproach of Universalism, that it is held by Socinians only. You have shown that it may be held by strenuous upholders of the great doctrine of the atonement for the sins of all mankind, by him who gave himself a ransom for all, and who is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world.

The advocates of Partialism and of Election and Reprobation are numerous and active. A proof of this may be seen in *The Times* of the 13th instant, and in several other London Journals, where there are "monster" advertisements announcing a republication of "Scott's Commentary," and containing a long list of the names of subscribers, both churchmen and dissenters. Among the latter is the name of one who was for twenty years a minister of the Established Church, but who, having seceded therefrom, has heaped the most unsparing abuse on his spiritual mother the Church of England. The republication of such a work, at such a time as this, in the ostentatious manner in which it is done, has an ominous aspect. It looks like the public declaration of a party in the church, of their determined hostility to liberal views of Christian doctrine, and of their full purpose to oppose such views.

The leading principle of "Scott's Commentary," is ultra Calvinism. It abounds in harsh condemnation of all systems, but that of the cruel and treacherous persecutor of Servetus unto death.

Among the supporters of this republication are to be found the names of many who occupy high stations in society. Thus the unwary may be induced, on the authority of names, to give encouragement to a work which advocates the unholy and unchristian tenet of election and its counterpart reprobation. The election of a few to eternal happiness—the reprobation of the many to the pains of eternal torments for the glory of the Most High!!

At such a time as this, it may be expedient to set before your readers a specimen of the work in question.

On Romans v. 15—19 Scott writes thus:—"The principal thing which renders the expositions generally given, of these verses, perplexed and unsatisfactory, arises from an evident misconception of the apostle's reasoning in supposing that Adam and Christ represented *exactly the same company:* whereas Adam was the surety of the *whole human species* as his posterity—Christ only of that *chosen race* which has been, or shall be, one with him by faith, who alone 'are counted to him for a generation.' Indeed all men, in consequence of the undertaking of Christ, are under a dispensation of mercy, and are endured with much long suffering; they have many temporal mercies, and they shall all rise to judgment."....."If we omit the consideration of the number who *perish* in the first Adam, or are saved in the second Adam, and if we exclusively consider the benefits which *believers* derive from Christ, as compared with the loss sustained in Adam, by the *human race*, we shall then see the passage open most perspicuously and glorious to our view."

This then, according to Scott, is the gospel—the "good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people," and which prompted the song of the "multitude of the heavenly host, praising God and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men."

According to Scott, *that* is a most glorious view of the gospel which represents it as bringing salvation to an elect few only, and as leaving the rest of mankind under a foredoomed condemnation to eternal torments, after the mere form and mockery of a trial, of which the issue is determined beforehand. It is true that he adds, with notable inconsistency, that "the thoughts of the *supposed* immense majority of those who shall eventually perish, is apt to encumber the mind in these contemplations; I say *supposed*, for possibly we shall find our *conjectures* erroneous, when the doom of men, through all ages and nations, shall be finally determined."

So then the system of Calvinistic exclusion rests, by the confession of one of its most admired advocates, merely on *conjecture*. On conjectures alone men dare to build a system of doctrine, unscriptural, revolting to common sense,—a cause of infi-

delity—of spiritual pride, or of despair—of rejoicing to gainsayers—an injury to man, and an insult to Him whose mercy is over all the works of his hand.

After this strange admission, that his system rests on *conjectures*, Scott returns to that which, for a while he seemed to reject; and again he asserts the salvation of an elect few alone. At the end of the notes, on the passage in question, he adds that his explanation of St. Paul's words must be the true one, "except *universal salvation* with eternal glory be contended for."

Does he not thus, in effect, admit that the words of the apostle allow of no consistent interpretation, except on the hypothesis of *universal salvation?*

Such is the inconsistency of that Commentary which so many churchmen and dissenters "delight to honour" at this time, by a republication, under their joint but inauspicious patronage.

I am, Sir, yours very truly,

ONE WHO WISHES WELL TO ALL MANKIND.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

Sir,—Referring to Mr. Boardman's letter in your last Magazine, I beg to say, that, although I think with you that he has misunderstood the several texts of Scripture therein, you should not have summed the matter up in so few words, and referred him to Doctor Lee's work on Prophecy for proof of your statement, and for his enlightenment; but rather have, for the benefit of your *un*enlightened readers, pointed out his errors in plain terms—so plain "that a fool need not err therein"—or left it open for others to do so, as every one does not possess, or has the means of possessing, the Doctor's book for the information referred to. * * *

I may remark, that most eminent orthodox commentators confess their ignorance of the book of Revelation; and that the cited passages therefrom refer to things of time and sense, and not of eternity, is agreed by Hammond, Rosenmuller, Lightfoot, Grotius, and others.

Apologizing for these few remarks, and trusting that the truth will finally prevail,

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

May 9, 1850. CENSOR.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

Sir,—I cannot refrain from offering my humble but most sincere tribute of gratitude to the projectors of *The Universalist*. I have long desired to see a periodical devoted to this subject. By the mode in which you have hitherto conducted it, and which will I trust continue, it cannot, I should hope, fail, under God's blessing, of advancing the cause of truth, and setting in its true light the most momentous doctrine of Universalism, and vindicating "the ways of God to man."

If any argument were wanting to prove the necessity of such a publication, it would be found in the letter of Mr. Boardman in your last number. To any one who can read the Scriptures with unprejudiced eyes, the doctrine of Universalism (notwithstanding our very defective and Calvinistical translation) is as manifest as day—from Genesis to Revelation—under the Patriarchal, Levitical, and Gospel dispensations. I will not, however, atttempt to argue this matter with Mr. Boardman. His objections, and many others which have been brought forward, against this doctrine, have received abundant and satisfactory answers, both philological and theological, by a host of authors. I will however only mention three works, low in price and easily to be procured, and which I most strongly and earnestly recommend to his perusal; and, if he be indeed a lover of truth and desirous of searching it out, he will have ample assistance in finding it. These works are, 1. Winchester's "Universal Restoration." 2. Chauncey's "Salvation of all Men." 3. Stonehouse's "Universal Restitution." One other book in company with these will of course suggest itself, namely, the Holy Bible; and if in the original languages, so much the better. If after a calm and impartial perusal of these three treatises, he can conscientiously say that his objections have not been removed, I shall be content that he shall call Universalism *heresy;* but not till then.

Yours, &c.,

May 9, 1850. L. J. F.

[We are thankful to Censor for his friendly admonition, and to L. J F. for his unqualified approbation. Our apology to Censor is, that our limits must be accommodated to the claims of many correspondents; and that the time at our command seldom admits of long answers to opponents: but, whether long or short, our pages are not the less open to the reception of others: Independently, however, of these circumstances, a lengthy discussion did not seem to us most suitable to Mr. Boardman's letter. He put forward his views with such an air of superiority,—we may say, of infallibility,—that we considered them as calling for something more immediately decisive, and we accordingly referred him to a principle, which levelled them at a single blow, namely the long past fulfilment of all prophecy, set forth in Doctor Lee's works; and laid before our readers in the Summary of it contributed by Paroikos to three of our numbers, and now brought to a conclusion. Censor himself has made a remark to the same purpose, which we are induced to leave to its unembarrassed operation. We think it probable, that Mr. Boardman is not unacquainted with the works which L. J. F. recommends. They are not, however, the first that we would put into an inquirer's hands. They establish the great general truth of God's universal and unconquerable love; but the subject has been much more advanced by subsequent writers. Objections, of which they were not aware, have been removed, and particular passages more correctly explained.—Ed.]

THE UNIVERSALIST.

JULY, 1850.

ON THE DURATION OF THE UNIVERSE.

It is a question, whether the present heavens and earth will come to an end. The first intimation of the subject occurs in Gen. viii. 21, 22, in which the words "as I have done" seem to restrict the means of destruction to "the waters of a flood," as expressed in ix. 15; and the expression "while the earth remaineth," is undecisive. According to the common opinion, founded on a literal acceptation of 2 Pet. iii. 7, they are reserved to a fiery destruction; but, if "the covenant with every living creature" affords security against the less infliction, it must do so much more against the greater. This argument is legitimate, usual, and conclusive. The ten tribes of Israel derived no consolation from reflecting, that their chastisement with whips should be exchanged for that of scorpions. As, however, there are passages, which lead more directly to this conclusion, I shall proceed to examine them.

Thus saith Jehovah, (Jer. xxxi.)
Who giveth the sun for a light by day,
The ordinances (חקה) of the moon and stars for a light by night,
Who stilleth the sea when the waves thereof roar,
Jehovah of hosts is his name: (35.)
If these ordinances (החקים) depart from before me, saith Jehovah,
Then the seed of Israel shall also cease from being a nation before me, for ever. (36.)

That is, (substituting the direct for the hypothetical form,) These ordinances shall not depart from before me, or they shall continue; and so likewise the seed of Israel shall not cease from being a nation, or shall continue to be a nation.

Here the sense throughout is evidently literal. The luminaries of which the perpetuity is here asserted, are the literal sun, moon, and stars; and this perpetuity is the token, or pledge, which guarantees that of the seed. Their purpose, also, "to give light on the earth," necessarily requires the perpetuity of

the earth to receive it; and the perpetuity of the inhabitants that also of the habitation. See also Jer. xxxiii. 20, 21; Ps. lxxii. 7, 17; and lxxxix. 35—37; to the same purpose.

Praise him, ye sun and moon,
Praise him, all ye stars of light. Ps. cxlviii. 3.)

He hath also established them for ever and ever,
He hath made a decree, (חק) which shall not pass. (6.)

I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Antient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given to him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away; and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed. Dan. vii. 13, 14.

In Psalm cxlviii. the word translated *decree* is the same as that translated *ordinances* in Jer. xxxi. 35, 36; the reign over "all people, nations, and languages," is clearly a reign over *subjects on earth*; and of both these it is said, that they shall *not pass away*. The verbs in the Hebrew and Chaldee are not the same; but they express the same negation, and this negation ascribes the same perpetuity both to the heavenly ordinances and to the Messianic reign.

What profit hath a man of all his labour, which he taketh under the sun? Eccles. i. 3.

And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom, under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him. Dan. vii. 27.

Labour "under the sun" is labour *on earth*, and a kingdom "under the whole heaven" is a kingdom *on earth;* of which kingdom, or reign, the perpetuity is here asserted. I admit the word עלם (everlasting) to be, in itself, indefinite; but, taken in connection with the negations previously cited, it must here denote a proper eternity.

The literal sense ofthese passages being thus clear, it follows, that all those which seem to have a different import must be figurative; or must denote changes, or revolutions, in the state, or condition, of governments and nations. But, not to rest in this general inference, let us come to the passages themselves. Indeed, the figurative sense is admitted in so many instances, as will limit the task of examination to the following, which appear to be considered as the only exceptions.

A | a | For this is as the waters of Noah unto me: (Isai. liv. 9—)
a | b | For as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth;
| c | so I have sworn, that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee. (—9.)

A | *b* | For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; (10—) } saith Jehovah, who hath mercy on thee. (—10.)
c | but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, }

A | Comparison. | a | Gen. (Isai. liv. 9—)
| *a* | Par. | b | Waters of Noah. Neg.
| c | Displeasure. Neg. (—9.)
A | Contrast. | *b* | Mountains. Pos. (10—)
| *c* | Kindness. Neg. (—10.)

This passage refers to the universal covenant with Noah and every living creature, which is here made a pledge of the special covenant with the church; and, as it has been proved, that the former secures the perpetuity of the literal heavens and earth, the mountains and hills, in this place, must be figurative, or denote great and powerful opponents.

Of old, thou hast laid the foundation of the earth. (Ps. cii.)
And the heavens are the work of thy hands. (25.)
They shall perish, but thou shalt endure:
Yea, all of them shall wax old, like a garment,
And as a vesture thou shalt change them, and they shall be changed;. (26.)
But thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end. (27.)

The eternity of God is signified, in verses 12 and 24, by its continuance "throughout all generations," parallel to "no end" in ver. 27; the contrast with which, in verses 25 and 26, leaves no alternative between a figurative sense or an absurdity: the continuance of the inhabitants and the discontinuance of the habitation .This sense is confirmed by its citation in the epistle to the Hebrews (i. 10—12): an epistle, the chief purpose of which is to prove the abolition of the old covenant, symbolized by the old, or figurative heavens and earth (Hag. ii. 6, Heb. xii. 26, 27.); and by the verb "wax old" (παλαιοω, Sept.) viii. 13, expressly applied to it.

A | Hearken to me, my people, (Isai. li.)
| And give ear to me, O my nation;
| For a law shall proceed from me,
| And I will make my judgment to rest for a light to the people. (4.)
| My righteousness is near,
| My salvation is gone forth,
| And my arms shall judge the people;
| The isles shall wait on me,
| And on my arm they shall trust. (5.)
B | a | c | Lift up your eyes to the heavens,
| | | And look on the earth beneath,
| | d | For the heavens shall vanish away, like smoke,
| | And the earth shall wax old, like a garment,
| | And they that dwell therein shall die in like manner:
| b | But my salvation shall be for ever,
| And my righteousness shall not be abolished. (6.)

A | Hearken to me, ye that know righteousness,
| The people in whose heart is my law;
B | *a* | *c* | Fear not the reproach of men,
| | | Neither be ye afraid of their revilings; (7.)
| | *d* | For the moth shall eat them up, like a garment,
| | And the worm shall eat them, like wool:
| *b* | But my righteousness shall be for ever,
| And my salvation from generation to generation. (8.)

A | Call to the people of God. (Isai. li. 4, 5.)
B | Contrast. | a | Fig. | c | Heavens and Earth.
| | d | To vanish.
| b | Salvation and righteousness. (6.)
A | Call to the righteous.
B | Contrast. | *a* | Lit. | *c* | Men. (7.)
| *d* | To be devoured.
| *b* | Righteousness and salvation. (8.)

The whole passage is addressed to the people of God, *the people in whose heart is his law*, or who had been brought under the new covenant, (Jer. xxxi. 33,) for the purpose of fortifying their minds against the fear of men; and this from a consideration of their contrasted awards: that of the destruction of their enemies, and of their own imperishable salvation. The part in question appears in the arrangement under a, and is shown to be figurative by its correspondence to *a*, the literal sense of which affords a very clear explanation of it. Besides which, we meet, in d, with terms and comparisons often used, in other places, to express the abolition of the old dispensation; and the same applied, in *d*, to its malevolent adherents.

I am aware of but three more disputed passages. Matt. v. 18, xxiv. 35, and 2 Pet. iii. 7. All, however, taken in connection with their contexts, and with the foregoing proofs, require the same figurative sense. In the context of the first, our Lord speaks of the fulfilment of the law and the prophets, which he makes cotemporaneous with the passing away of the heaven and the earth, or of the typical and evanescent dispensation; and in that of the second, he foretels its abolition. Indeed, the figurative style of ver. 35, is plainly a resumption of that which he had already employed in verses 29 and 30. As to the third, its context furnishes three reasons against the literal interpretation. 1st. The reference, in ver. 2, to the words of the apostles and prophets, in which we find no intimation of it. 2dly. The reference to a promise of a new heaven and new earth, immediately to succeed those which should be dissolved, found only in the two last chapters of Isaiah, particularly in lxv. 17, explained in the rest of the chapter to signify Jerusalem and her people. Comp. Heb. xii. 22, and Rev. xxi. 2. 3dly. The reference, in ver. 16, to the epistles of Paul, as "speaking of these things," in which we read of no consumption but that which should destroy the wicked.

For the fullest satisfaction on this subject, the reader is referred to Dr. Lee's Letter to George Stanley Faber, B. D., containing an Interpretation of 2 Pet. iii. 1, seq. &c.

R. R.

ON THE HEBREW AND GREEK WORDS TRANSLATED "CURSE."

We have remarked, with no small degree of sorrow, that the "translators" of the authorised version of the Scriptures are more fond of the word "curse" than the original warrants, either of the Old or New Testament.

In the former, seven different Hebrew words are translated "curse," when one only of them has that signification. Those words are אלה, קלל, ארור, חרם, שבע, קבה and ברך. Something like this is to be found in the translation of the New Testament, in which the word ἀνάθεμα occurs about ten times.

At a late meeting we believe at the Hanover Square rooms, Dr. Biber, speaking of some who differed from him as to modes of education, quoted St. Paul, Gal. i. 8, 9, where we read the word "accursed," in our version. Dr. Biber applied this fearful word to those who entertained an opinion different from his. Now, even if the apostle, speaking by inspiration, had declared some others accursed, this would not justify any uninspired man in doing so. It is remarkable that our divine Lord, who alone knew the hearts of men, has frequently applied strong terms of condemnation to others; while in the New Testament, no such terms are related to have been used by others. True it is, that St. Paul, in 1 Cor. xv, is made to say "Thou fool;" but, in the original, he uses no such word—but ἄφρον, *O inconsiderate*, or *unthinking*. A similar mistake is made by the translators in Eph. v. 15, where we have the word "fools" instead of *unwise*. (ἄσοφοι.)

When Paul uses the word ἀνάθεμα, he does not violate his own rule. He does not judge anything before the time. Still less does he condemn and curse. He leaves judgment to him to whom judgment belongs. In Rom. ix. 3, we have the word "accursed" in the text and "separated" in the margin. The copies of the Bible possessed by the poor are, it is to be feared, too often those which have not the marginal readings. Hence they are often misled. It is now we believe generally admitted that the marginal readings, in our translation are, for the most part, more correct than those of the text. The former look like the protest of a convinced *minority*, overcome by a *majority* of voters: the latter often remind one of the triumph of authority over sense and right. The Calvinistic tendency of the translators is admitted by a high authority, that of the present Archbishop of Canterbury, who has written forcibly against the gloomy tenets of the school of Geneva. Referring to 1 Cor. ix. 27, he writes "This is one of the many passages which have suffered by the general bias of the age in which our translation was made."—See "Apostolical Preaching Considered." By the Rev. J. B. Sumner, M.A. Second edition. 1817. Note. p. 187.

In Rom. ix. 3, before spoken of, we read, ηὐχόμην γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου. κ. τ. λ. Wicklif, for the word "accursed" in the text, and "separated" in the margin, has "departed."

Tyndal and Cranmer have "cursed."

The Genevese version has "separate."

The Rhenish reads "anathema."

Granville Penn, in his admirable translation of the New Covenant, seems to have translated this passage correctly thus—"I did boast that I was set apart by Christ for the sake of my brethren." He quotes Justin Martyr and Chrysostom to prove that the word ἀνάθεμα means "a thing set apart." Dr. Adam Clark quotes Theodoret to the same effect—ηὐχόμην is the imperfect tense of ευχομαι, and signifies "glorior esse, jacto me esse." See Scapula. Εὔχομαι is thus used by Homer in the Iliad and in the Odyssey. In the lxx, the word ἀνάθεμα answers to the word חרם, which is sometimes taken in a good sense, as in Levit. xxvi. 28, where the חרם, or devoted thing, is called most holy. Achan, mentioned in Joshua, committed a trespass, not in the accursed thing, but in that which was devoted to the Lord. St. Paul, in 1 Cor. xvi. 22,

writes, "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema maran-atha." Many take this to be a bitter curse. To us it seems to be no such thing. The apostle here directs that apostates from the faith should be put away from the company of the faithful, who retained their love for the Saviour. St. Paul passes no heavier sentence against them: he remits them to the time when maran-atha, the Lord shall come, and give a just and infallible judgment. Meanwhile the apostle judges nothing before the time.—See I Cor. iv. 3, and v. 13.

The glib facility with which many professed disciples of the gospel of mercy anathematize those who cannot repeat their Shibboleth, nor receive their peculiar dogmata, is a scandal to our faith and a hindrance to its reception. The hardness of heart thus evinced seems to arise from the unscriptural notion of everlasting *vindictive* punishment, instead of *corrective* suffering, inflicted, for the ultimate benefit of those who are made to suffer, by Him who is essential and unchangeable love.

A notable specimen of this is to be found in the writings of one Dr. Raffles. It is reported in the "British Pulpit," No. 3, vol. i. p. 63, 64. The learned Doctor first describes the glory and felicity of the "*saints*," and then revels in a description of the torments of those whom he calls "*sinners*." He first assumes that the "sinner" will always continue a sinner and a rebel, and then asks with much *naiveté*, "And what evidence have we that the rebellion of the finally impenitent will not endure for ever?" Surely the *onus probandi* lies with himself. He continues, "What scripture do you bring to prove that it will not?" The Universalist may answer, from the former numbers of this work, that there are many such parts of Scripture. He goes on—"Here then for a moment pause; fill your imagination with ages, and myriads of ages, till they equal in number the atoms that compose the universe, and even this mighty calculation, could you make it, would not measure the duration of the torments of the damned." . . . . "Even death itself comes not to their relief; they are dying, yet can never die! They seek for it as for hid treasure; but the monster whom they shunned on earth shuns them in hell, and, like a phantom, ever eludes their grasp. Even annihilation, from which the mind shrinks back with horror now, would be a welcome guest: but it must not be; this last boon that despair solicits is denied. No! they must never be annihilated: they cannot die—they shall live for ever—for ever—in torment, compared with which our most excruciating pain were ease, and the most terrible mortal calamity a trifling accident." He adds much more to the same effect; but *ohe! jam satis.*

Much more to the same effect might be added from Augustine, Fulgentius, Calvin, "*President*" Edwards, and others.

The doctrine of everlasting vindictive punishment is a Pagan, Manichæan, and Popish fraud; an insult to the Most High; a cause of infidelity, and a great injury to man. The endeavours, therefore, of those who would disabuse the world in this matter are worthy of all praise; and, if our wishes and prayers prevail, will be attended with great and universal success.

ONE WHO WISHES WELL TO ALL MANKIND.

EXTRACTS FROM THE WRITINGS OF BISHOP NEWTON.

Dissertation LX, entitled "On the Final State and Condition of Man."

The Bishop, having disproved the possibility of annihilation to the wicked, instanced the limited sense in which the words "everlasting," "eternal," "for ever," &c. are sometimes used; and, having cited the opinion of many of the Christian Fathers and Hebrew Doctors in testimony of the limited punishment of the wicked, then proceeds:—

"I forbear to produce any modern authorities, though perhaps the modern may be as good or better than the antient; but all authorities must bow down before Scripture: this is the only solid foundation of faith, this is the only sure anchor of hope. The letter of Scripture may indeed sound forth everlasting punishments; but the spirit of Scripture intimates the contrary. How the letter is to be understood, and in what sense the punishments are everlasting, we have already explained; and this explanation will be most amply confirmed by the whole strain and tenor of Scripture, which breathes nothing but mercy and kindness, pity and forgiveness, to the sons of men. Texts innumerable might be cited and applied to this purpose; but weight is more to be regarded than number. Even in the Mosaical Law the Lord proclaims himself, (Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7,) "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin." But how can such attributes consist with a system of irrevocable vengeance for thousands, transgressions never to be forgiven, and torments never to have an end? In like manner the Psalmist declares, (ciii. 8, 9,) "The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy. He will not always chide, neither will he keep his anger for ever." And may we not then with justice apply the words of another Psalm, (lxxxv. 5, 6,) "Wilt thou be angry with us for ever? wilt thou draw out thine anger to all generations? Wilt thou not receive us again, that thy people may rejoice in thee?" God doth not willingly grieve and afflict the children of men; and therefore it is called by the prophet Isaiah, (xxviii. 21,) "his strange work, his strange act;" as if it was very uncommon and foreign to his nature. But with what propriety can that be denominated "his strange work, his strange act," which is wrought, not in a few, but in abundance of instances; and is to continue, not for a short period of time, but throughout all generations? "As I live, saith the Lord God," by the prophet Ezekiel, (xxxiii. 12,) "I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked may turn from his way, and live." And can it be his will and pleasure that no wicked man should perish, but repent and live, and yet be his will and pleasure that so many of his creatures should be reduced to a state of final impenitence, where they cannot turn and live, but must perish everlastingly? But the great charter of universal redemption is the gospel, which will be found in the end what it was proclaimed at the beginning, (Luke ii. 14,) "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, and good-will towards men." But what glory to God to see a number of his creatures plunged in the depth of misery? What good-will towards men to consign so many of them to ever-

lasting punishment? Our blessed Lord in saying, (Matt. v. 26,) "Thou shalt by no means come out thence (out of prison) till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing;" and, (xviii. 34,) "His lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him;" sufficiently implies that some time or other satisfaction may be made, the debts of sin be discharged, and the sinner himself released from prison. It is the declared end and purpose of our blessed Saviour's coming into the world to recover and to redeem lost mankind. "The Son of man," as he saith himself, (Luke xix. 10,) "is come to seek and to save that which was lost." And shall the purpose of his coming be so far frustrated and defeated, as that the greater part of those whom he came to seek and to save shall be lost and undone for ever? How often is he styled "the Saviour of the world," in the full extent and meaning of the words! (John iii. 17,) "God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved;" (1 John iv. 14,) "We have seen and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world;" (1 Tim. ii. 4,) "God will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth;" (iv. 10,) "He is the Saviour of all men, especially those that believe;" (2 Pet. iii. 9,) "He is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance;" (1 John ii. 1, 2,) "We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world;" (Luke iii. 6,) "And all flesh shall see the salvation of God." And, after so many gracious promises and assurances of universal salvation, is he the Saviour of the world only intentionally, and not effectually; or is he to seek only the chosen few, and to leave the many under eternal condemnation? His very enemies are reconciled to God by the merits and sufferings of his beloved Son. (Rom. v. 10,) "When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life;" (2 Cor. v. 19,) "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them;" (Col. i. 19, &c.) "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself: by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. And you that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled, in the body of his flesh, through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreproveable in his sight;" (Rom. xi. 32,) "God hath concluded all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all." But what kind of peace and reconciliation is that, where they still live in open enmity, and are treated as enemies; where vengeance still pursues them, and their misery has no end? For the reward of his sufferings, God highly exalted his Son, and (Eph. i. 20, &c.) "set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." But he can never attain these glorious ends, he can never be "far above all principality and power," or "be head over all," or "fill all in all," as long as there

are evil angels and evil men, who are in rebellion against, and to their utmost power resist and oppose his will. (1 John iii. 8,) "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil;" but the "works of the devil" cannot be said with truth to be "destroyed," as long as any wickedness subsists in the world. It is repeated again and again, that he must "put all things under his feet;" but the subjection of intelligent creatures consists, not in their being kept under by superior force and violence, but in the change of their affections, and the submission of their wills, (2 Cor. x. 5,) "casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." In this manner must all creatures bow down to him, and acknowledge him, before the end come. (Phil. ii. 10, 11,) "At the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." And (Rev. v. 13,) "Every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever." As he was the Creator, so he will be the Saviour of all things. (John i. 3,) "All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made;" (Col. i. 16, 17,) "By him were all things created, that are in heaven, and in the earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." And we may be certain that he who made the world will not suffer it to remain in eternal disorder; but will rectify and restore his own creation."

PROFESSOR STUART'S DIFFICULTIES.

The aged and learned Professor Stuart, of Andover, is in great difficulty in respect to the question of endless sin and punishment. He is a good man. Although retired, he still gives to Andover the brightest gems of its crown. The most learned by far of any who have ever been Professors there, and far less bigoted and jesuitical than Dr. Woods, Professor Stuart has stood justly, in the estimation of the world, at the head of the Institution. He knows, he *feels* the difficulties that attend the doctrine of endless torture. If we were to say that he has *not* an undoubting faith on that doctrine, we should not be far from the truth. It fills his soul with distress even to *suspect* that it *may be true*. He said some little time since, in the *Biblical Repository*—

"That the subject (endless misery) is one of fearful interest, none will deny who believe in future retribution. That there are *difficulties* pressed by it on the mind, when one thinks of his own condition, that of his beloved friends, or of his brethren of the human race, it would be *mere pretence* to deny. But it is a consolation to believe, that behind any clouds, however dark, that interpose

between us and the light of heaven, its beams still shine clearly. All will be clear in the light of heaven. If *parents, husbands, wives, brothers, sisters, must see* those dear as their own life perish at last, while they themselves are saved, heaven in mercy will either *extinguish their social susceptibilities*, or else give them such a *sweet* and overpowering sense of the *justice and goodness* of God, as shall not permit the joys of the blessed to be marred, nor the songs of the redeemed to be interrupted, with the sighs of sympathetic sorrow."

How different this from the language of such ranting, ignorant men as Elder Knapp, or Colver, or Finney, or others of that class! Professor S. regards the subject of endless misery as one of fearful interest. It is surrounded with difficulties; especially when one thinks of his beloved friends. It would be *mere pretence*, says the Professor, to deny this. Mark now what farther the Professor says, and see the doubtful state of his mind on this point:—"If," says he, "IF parents, husbands, wives, brothers, sisters, must see those dear as their own life perish at last, while they themselves are saved, heaven will either extinguish their social susceptibilities, or else give them such a sweet and overpowering sense of the justice and goodness of God, as shall not permit the joys of the blessed to be marred, or the songs of the redeemed to be interrupted, with the sighs of sympathetic sorrow." Now mark the great care with which the above sentence is framed. Mark the ingenious *if*. Why did not the Professor say, if he believed the doctrine, "Now, *as* parents, husbands, wives, brothers, sisters, must see," &c.? Why did he say, "IF parents, husbands, wives, brothers, sisters, must see those dear as their own life perish at last?" Are we not justified in supposing from this very language, that the Professor has great doubts of the awful doctrine to which he refers? He does not assert the truth of that doctrine. He merely hypothesizes. But more than all this—see how improbable he makes its truth. It is as improbable, in the opinion of the Professor, as that God should "extinguish all our social sensibilities," *i. e.* all our love, all our benevolence, all our sympathy. What a place would heaven be, if the social sensibilities of all its inmates were extinguished! No love, no interest in the welfare of others, no rejoicing in others' joy. Send us to a barren desert—send us to Nova Zembla—send us to the regions of eternal ice, that clusters around the poles of the earth; for in all those places we should find the milk of human kindness flowing, that no drought could dry up or cold congeal; but send us not to any place, even though it be called heaven, where the *social susceptibilities are all extinguished*. See, also, that the Professor states that the extinguishing of our social susceptibilities would be a merciful act, horrid as it appears, compared with endless torture. If the doctrine of endless torture be true, heaven *in mercy* will extinguish our social susceptibilities. Will God do this? No, answers reason, never. Professor Stuart either did not see the force of the language he used, or else he evidently has great doubts of the truth of the doctrine in question.

One thing more before we close. If God shall not extinguish our social susceptibilities, he will give us "such a *sweet* and overpowering sense of the justice and goodness of God, as shall not permit the joys of the blessed to be marred, nor the songs of the redeemed to be interrupted, with the sighs of sympathetic sorrow." Here then is another thought which the Professor gives us'

as to the improbability of the truth of the doctrine of endless torture. Aside from the fact, that the love and justice of God are opposed to that doctrine, he shows that there is no other way to suppose that doctrine true, but by regarding the justice and the goodness that could decree men to an endless hell *as sweet*. What should we think of an orthodox clergyman, if he should arise in the sacred desk, and address the Almighty as follows?—"O God, if thou shalt make any portion of thy creatures endlessly unhappy, then thy love and thy justice will be *sweet*, ay, sweeter than the honey and the honeycomb; yea, O Lord, they shall be so sweet, as to be absolutely *overpowering*." Now, did Professor Stuart, that man of learning and sound sense, believe that this is *probable*? Did he believe that the love of God would be sweeter to men in view of their dearest friends suffering endless damnation, than if all were made holy and happy? No: he believed no such thing. We should insult him—we should represent him to be destitute of common sense, if we were to intimate anything of the kind. See then the force of the particle *if*. IF this doctrine of endless torture be true, then all these impossibilities would occur. And therefore the whole effect of the paragraph we have quoted is, to show that Professor Stuart had great doubts as to the truth of the doctrine of endless torture; so that he said, if that doctrine were true, some of the greatest monstrosities and impossibilities must occur.

Let this paragraph from the pen of the Professor, be circulated far and wide; let it be read by all sects; and let them all see how exceedingly improbable is the truth of the diabolical dogma of endless torture.—*Star in the West; Cincinnati, May 18th*, 1850.

ON 1 JOHN II. 2.

"Some commentators by *the whole world* understand the whole world of the elect. But nowhere else in Scripture doth *the world* signify the elect. The appellation is given, either to the wicked of the world, (ver. 16,) or to mankind in general: in which latter sense John uses it here, to show that Christ is a propitiation, not for the sins of the Jews only, but also for the sins of all mankind."—*Mac Knight.* He however explains away this universality in his paraphrase:—"*And*, the merit of his death is so great, that *he is the propitiation for our sins*, who have embraced the gospel; *and not for ours only, but even for the sins of the whole world* of penitents, who forsake their sins." But who is it enables any one to embrace the gospel, or who gives repentance? Who, but God? Acts xvi. 14, v. 31, xi. 18. All such glosses represent men as independent of their Maker, or as if they could bestow these gifts on themselves. Besides, as all converts are penitents, and all penitents are converts, they really constitute but one class, and the distinction in the text is nullified.

An ineffectual propitiation is no propitiation. If then God, who alone can make it effectual, does it not in this life, it follows that he will do it in the next.

The apostle makes two unlimited assertions, which consistency requires to be either both believed or both denied; but of which the former is generally believed, and the latter is generally denied.

R. R.

Anecdote against Universalism.

The "Christian Secretary," the Baptist Journal of the State of Connecticut, has an anecdote entitled, "Father Haynes, and the Universalist." It is here subjoined:

Father Haynes and the Universalist.

A Universalist preacher, who prided himself on his ability to propound perplexing questions to orthodox ministers, had sought an interview with the Rev. Samuel Haynes. Upon being introduced, Mr. Haynes said, somewhat abruptly, "You are the man who teaches that men may swear, steal, and get drunk, and do all other like things, and yet go to heaven, a'n't you?" "By no means," replied the preacher, "I teach no such thing." "Well, you believe it, don't you?" rejoined Mr. Haynes. The man could not say "No," and there the debate ended.

The only reply this is worthy of, is the following paraphrase:

A Calvinistic preacher, who prided himself on his ability to propound perplexing questions to Universalist ministers, had sought an interview with the Rev. A. B. Upon being introduced, Mr. A. B. said somewhat abruptly, "You are the man who teaches that the elect may swear, steal, get drunk, and do all other like things, and yet go to heaven, a'n't you?" "By no means," replied the Calvinist, "I teach no such thing." "Well, you believe it, don't you?" rejoined A. B. The man could not say, "No," and there the debate ended. *Boston Trumpet.*

"*Their works do follow them.*" We often hear what sinners have to do in order to salvation; their works are to go *before* them; but those who know the mercy of God in Christ, rejoice in the gratuitousness of salvation, and *their* works do *follow* them,—for they are fruits of salvation. Z.

The Safe Side. As a reason for rejecting the doctrine of Universal Salvation, it has been urged, "I am on the safe side in maintaining the doctrine of eternal punishment." Reader! if this be your plea, we would ask you, Are you *certain* of your own salvation? If you are not, you surely cannot feel satisfied of being on the safe side. If you are, what is the ground of your certainty? Do you imagine that endless, boundless bliss is yours, because you merit it, while multitudes of your fellow creatures deserve only eternal, unmitigated woe? You say, No; but if this be not your hope, then it must be in him who is good to *all*, and whose tender mercies are over all his works. Z.

The doctrine of universal salvation is the top-stone and key-stone of the whole Christian system. Leave this out, and all the rest falls into a state of disintegration and confusion. And thus it has happened to the Christian Church ever since this ultimate fact of Christianity has been lost sight of. Let this be restored, and all the several divisions and parties thereof will become one.

Its opposite, in having polluted the fountain, i. e. the divine character, has rendered turbid all the streams of theology. We can scarcely call to mind a single text of Scripture, doctrine, or ordinance, which has not suffered by its influence. Discourse on John x. 17, 18. By W. Teulon, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

The Child like the Father. We are exhorted by our Saviour to love our enemies, that we may be like our Father who is in heaven. How, then, should we show our love to our enemies? By torturing them without intermission or by inflicting a cruel death? Yet, after this fashion orthodoxy depicts the character of him, whom the Scriptures declare to have so loved his enemies, that *even while they were yet enemies*, he reconciled them to himself by the death of his Son. Z.

The Best Argument. If we would teach Universalism, let us *live* it. The "living epistles of Christ" will be much more powerful in silencing opponents, than the longest pen-and-ink epistles filled with the severest logic. Z.

Universalism "too good to be true." In other words, "My goodness is so much more comprehensive than God's, as to embrace the millions who are to suffer eternal torments, whom his infinitude fails to reach." Z.

POETRY.

MATTHEW XVIII. 21.

By our own niggard rule we try
The hopes to suppliants given:
We meet our love as if our eye
Saw to the end of heaven.

Yes, ransom'd sinner! would'st thou know
How often to forgive,
How dearly to embrace thy foe,
Look where thou hop'st to live.

When thou hast told those isles of light,
And fancied all beyond,
Whatever owns, in depth or height,
Creation's wondrous bond:

Then in their solemn pageant learn
Sweet mercy's praise to see:
Their Lord resign'd them all to earn
The bliss of pardoning thee.

KEBLE'S CHRISTIAN YEAR.

THE SAVIOUR'S LOVE.

BY ALFRED OLIFANT.

The Saviour's love! what tongue can tell
Who worthily proclaim?
His praise let all conspire to swell,
And own his wondrous name.

The Saviour's love! what line can bound
Its infinite extent?
In earth's remotest clime 'tis found
To every sinner sent.

The Saviour's love! by it we stand
Acquitted in God's sight:
The heirs to Heaven's eternal land
Of perfect love and light.

Higher Brompton.

REVIEWS.

An Exposition of the Ninth Chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans. By JAMES MORRISON, Kilmarnock. London, Ward and Co. 1849.

BEFORE showing our opinion as to the merit or demerit of this work, we present to our readers an extract from the book itself. Take the following from page 429 to page 435, being what is called an Exposition of Rom. ix. 21.

"God's first and foremost wish was to render all men honourable and glorious in the immutable destiny to be assigned to them. It is the first and the fullest desire of the heart of the Almighty God, to make even every mortal man that breathes a vessel unto honour.—Yes it is God's true, and honest, and most ardent desire, to make even you, whosoever thou art, all glorious within, and all glorious without; and that, too, throughout eternity, and in his own most glorious heaven." . . . .

"While it is the first and foremost desire of God to give to all sinners on earth an immutable destiny of glory and honour, and while he uses suitable means to have them crowned with this destiny, he finds himself shut up to give an unalterable destiny of dishonouring woe to millions of men. He finds no pleasure in their death; but yet finds himself shut up to inflict it. He wills them to be saved; but yet he finds himself shut up to substitute damnation instead of salvation. O! what a sad and melancholy item of the parable is this! it weeps at the grave of myriads that might have lived before the throne. But, mark! it does not weep, because of a lack of love in the bosom of the Almighty Potter that fashioned their eternal destinies. O! no; it is from the sinners themselves—not at all from God."...."When, then, we find the potter in the parable before us preparing a lump of his clay for fine and glorious vessels, and yet shut up to make out of it many base vessels that were to be dishonoured in the use to which they should be put, do we not almost irresistibly come to the conclusion that he must have found many portions of his well-prepared lump corrupted and spoiled by vile foreign ingredients? Is there any other conclusion at which enlightened reason can arrive?

"In proof of this, we have Jer. xviii. 1—4. And the vessel was marred in the hands of the potter; so he made it again another vessel, as seemed good to the potter to make it. It did not turn out as the potter wished it. Why so? His clay had been spoiled."....

"The single and solitary reason why God, when desirous to make all vessels of honour, yet finds himself shut up to sink multitudes of them into the depths of opposite ignominy and shame, is that these multitudes of sinners, whom God tries by all possible means to fit and fashion for glory, do not turn out as he desires them—they are marred in his hand.

"The corruption in themselves is not native to them as creatures of God's hand. It belonged not originally to them. Through the opened aperture of the God-resisting choice of their tempted wills, Satan threw into their hearts a spoiling unbelief, an utterly vitiating impenitence, which led them to refuse their Saviour, and let go their sins. God was shut up to give them a Pharaoh-like destiny. Is there aught here unworthy of God? aught inconsistent with the simplicity, grace, and glory of his revealed and soul-wooing will in reference to the salvation of men? O! is there? Tell me ye candid enquirers. Is not NO the thunder of your reply? Let then Unconditionalism, Necessitarianism, and partiality of dealing, get their graves where they may, for their carcases to lie in; the words of this verse (Rom. ix. 21) start back from having the slightest taint of their putridity."

Dear fellow men, whoever you may be in name or religion, who may read the preceding extract, remember that the author is a Doctor of Divinity; and held in admiration as such, and as a sound Christian, by thousands of his fellow mortals: that this book of his has an extensive circulation, and has been reviewed by some of his own school with the most unqualified approbation. One of these reviewers, says, "The body of the Lectures stands as an impregnable bulwark to guard Rom. ix. against having thrust upon it the altogether foreign Predestinarian monstrosities of John Calvin, with which the inspired writer of that chapter had no sympathy or sentiment in common." *Christian News*, July 3, 1849. Another reviewer says, "Mr. Morrison's Lectures contain not small shot for sparrows, but large shot for the bird of Jove," &c. Our opinion is, that the shot contained in the Lectures is lighter than vanity, and incapable of doing real hurt to any one whose eyes are opened; while, by coming in contact with the eyes of a blind man, like a cloud of dust, it is calculated to shut up the blind eyes more and more from the light. Had the potsherd aimed his shot at the potsherds of the earth only, he might have brought down some game, and spared the following remarks; but the fact is, that, however unintentionally, he has directed the thunder and smoke of his demi-guns, not against sparrows, mere men, or the bird of Jove, but against the word of Jehovah. Shall it prosper? shall it not wither in the furrows where it grew? Ezek. xvii. 15.

Were the assertion of the author of the Lectures true, that the first and foremost, true, honest, and most ardent *desire* of God, was to make every mortal man that breathes a vessel unto honour, and yet that he is "shut up" to make myriads and multitudes of the human family vessels to dishonour, and consign them to an eternal hell, there to suffer the most intolerable agonies; and to roar, curse, and blaspheme world without end; then the desire of God must remain eternally unaccomplished, his first and foremost intention be completely frustrated; and Job fell into a downright mistake when he said, "But he is in one mind, and who can turn him? and what his soul *desireth*, even that he doth." Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto Mr. Morrison more than unto Job, judge ye.

By the word of God the worlds were framed, and the heavens were of old: by the word of God, was every thing made that is made: of his word he saith, "it shall not return unto me void; but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I send it." Isai. lv. 11. He made *all* things very good, and all things are still very good; every creature, consciously or unconsciously, serving the very purpose for which the almighty and all-wise Creator intended it.

In a great house, vessels to dishonour are in their place, and are as necessary and useful as vessels unto honour. He created the smith to make us shovels and tongs, and he created the waster to destroy. Every human vessel that breathes, when it has done the work appointed for it in time, is sown in dishonour, and shall be remade and raised in glory for eternity. The God of this Lecturer must have been completely destitute of foreknowledge, otherwise he could not have fallen into such a melancholy mistake as it seems he has done. He made myriads of creatures who turned out to be so much superior in power to their Creator, that they overcame every desire and attempt of his to save them; and so shut up the saving energy of their Creator, that "he was compelled to substitute damnation instead of salvation." How opposite to the ways

of the living and true God! *He* never made a creature, but he could make his sword approach against it.

Our Lecturer says, "When we find the potter, in the parable before us, preparing a lump of clay for fine and glorious vessels, and yet shut up to make out of it many base vessels that were to be dishonoured, do we not almost irresistibly come to the conclusion that he must have found many portions of his well-prepared lump corrupted and spoiled by vile foreign ingredients? Is there any other conclusion at which enlightened candour can arrive?" In proof of this we are referred to Jer. xviii. 1—4; but, alas! this passage is not *for*, but *against* his enlightened conclusion. Instead of the potter making his clay into vessels *contrary* to his desire, "He made it again another vessel as *seemed good* to the potter to make it." Not a word of spoiled clay; not a hint of foreign ingredients! From what the prophet saw in the pottery, he is taught that the ways of the Lord to the children of men are equal, however unequal the ways of men may be; that *all* men are in the hand of God, as clay in the hand of the potter; and that it is not in the power of men to shut up God from making them such vessels as seemeth good to him to make. Every vessel, whether unto honour or dishonour, in all that they do, are working out, though unknown to themselves, the grand and glorious purposes for which the Potter designed them; "doing what God's *hand* and counsel determined before to be done." Acts iv. 28.

The reviewer has been manager of a pottery these ten years, and we know that *our* potter would not, had he power to prevent it, permit one particle of vile foreign ingredients to enter his prepared lump.

Perhaps the following questions would come across the Expositor's mind: Who created the vile foreign ingredients? Could the Almighty Potter have prevented their existence, or prevented them from spoiling his clay? To assist him in answering these questions, he is under the necessity of bringing forward *Satan* as an auxiliary. "Through the opened aperture of the God-resisting choice of their tempted wills, Satan threw into their hearts a spoiling unbelief, an utterly vitiating impenitence, which led them to refuse their Saviour and not let go their sins."

Is Satan *able* to clear out the bewildered Expositor? No: he is more and more enveloped in the dark and waterless cloud.

Who gave existence to Satan? Who opened the aperture in the God-resisting choice of the wills of the base vessels? In what place of heaven, earth, hell, or sea, did Satan find his vile ingredients—unbelief and utterly vitiating impenitence? Did all these things come into existence contrary to the will of God? Nothing *can* come to pass in *opposition* to the will of the living and true God: for he doth *according* to his will in the heavens above and the earth beneath; none can stay his hand; and, as true as the prayers of Jesus were heard, the will of the Father *is* done, as in heaven so in earth. But, if such derangement took place with the God of the Expositor as he supposeth, in direct oppostion to the desire and will of this God, then he must have been so weak as not to be able to prevent it: he must have been asleep, or on a journey; otherwise it could not, in common comprehension, have occurred.

However, be that as it may, if the Bible be true, the God of the Bible made *all;* yea even the wicked, for the day of evil. Prov. xvi. 4. I am the Lord that maketh *all* things, that frustrateth the tokens of the liars, and maketh diviners (and doctors of divinity) mad; that turneth wise men backward, and maketh their knowledge foolish. Isai. xliv. 24, 25.

Man without law was as harmless as gunpowder without a spark of fire. God, for wise and glorious purposes, gave a law, and with it Satan blew up our first parents; and the smoke of the powder encircles us to this day. The law entered that the offence might abound: and God be thanked, that we were the servants of sin; for *where sin* abounded *grace* DID *much more* abound.

The question is put by our Expositor, "Is there aught here unworthy of God? aught inconsistent with the simplicity, and grace, and glory of his revealed will, in reference to the salvation of men?" If by *God* here the

writer means the "God of Paul's fathers,"—*Yes* is the thunder of the fearless reply of the writer of this, who says, Let unconditionalism, necessitarianism and partiality, be rendered to whom they are due. No graves need be as yet sought for them; for they are as much alive and in health as two thousand years ago. Partiality does not and cannot belong to *God*, or that wisdom which is from above; for God is no respecter of persons, and the wisdom which is from above, is *without* partiality. (James.) But the wisdom which descendeth not from above, is earthly, sensual, devilish, doing many things partially, and having respect to persons, saying, "Stand by thyself, come not near me, I am holier than thou."

Those who hold that eternal life is *conditionally* bestowed, are out-and-out respecters of persons, full of partiality; for they assert that those, and *those only*, who, in this life, show themselves to be really and sincerely holy, believing, repenting, non-resisting, accepting, willing to be saved, sinners, shall be partakers of eternal life,—so that it appears that conditionality, partiality, and free will, are the three-fold cord, on which almost the whole of the religious machinery of those called Arminians and Morrisonians is hung. The will of man is as free as that of a dependent creature can be; while, at the very most, it is but the *shadow* of free will. That being possessed of real free will must have every other existent being, both in will and power, absolutely under his control, and so uncontrolled by any other being; therefore those who imagine themselves to be possessed of real freewill, are they who exalt themselves above all that is called God.

The cord of free will, partiality, and conditionalism, may do for sounding the depths of Satan, but will be too short and too weak to bear poor sinners to immortal life. All those who limit the love, mercy, goodness, and justice of the Holy One to a part of his creatures, are in reality necessitarians, though they see not themselves so to be. They are under an irresistible necessity to act from the principle of free will, partiality, and conditionalism. They are merely *human*, and to more than this can human nature arrive? Nothing but the wisdom which is from above can overcome these earthly, sensual, devilish propensities.

Eternal life is the *gift* of God; and, according to the harmonious testimony of his revealed will, in reference to the salvation of men,—according to the simplicity of his grace and glory,—is in every sense of the words *unconditionally* bestowed. This unconditionalism of God our Lecturer seems to hate, and wish it in the grave.

Let him only allow the Potter to have, and exercise, the power that in this verse is ascribed to him, and then he may see that both the vessel to honour and to dishonour were made *such* vessels as *seemed good* to the potter to make them.

The same apostle who wrote the 21st verse of Rom. ix. said, "For where a testament is there must also *of necessity* be the death of the testator." Now unless these Anti-Calvinists deny that the death of the testator came to pass according to that which the hand and counsel of God had determined before to be done, it is not easy to see what ground they have to deny that "God hath foreordained all things whatsoever hath come to pass." But this they spurn at and reject with abhorrence.

The killing of the Prince of life was the most malicious, wicked, and murderous deed of all recorded in history. How inconsistent then to *admit* (as they must, or deny the Bible) that this was foreordained of God, and deny that *of* Him are *all* things? Calvinists hold limited salvation, but they hold also limited reconciliation. In this there is *some consistency*. But to profess belief in the Scriptural doctrine of universal atonement, and deny universal salvation, is a greater monstrosity than the greatest monstrosity in Calvinism. Let those who cavil with Calvin about unconditional grace, and absolute predestination, beware, lest they be fighting against Paul, and the God of Paul's fathers.

ANETAZΩ.

The Ultimate Manifestation of God to the World. By David Waldie. *London: H. K. Lewis.* 1847.

Quality, not quantity—weight of metal, not empty sound—are the characteristics of those literary productions which have gained the approbation of the sober-minded and discerning, and have stood the test of ages.

Tried by this standard, the tract now submitted to our critical revision is entitled to hold no mean rank among the emanations from the human intellect. Small although in point of size it be, it contains more true, because divine instruction, than is to be met with in whole cart-loads of theological rubbish. It is no exaggeration to say that "it is worth its weight in gold."

Its superiority is owing mainly to two causes:—

First. The entirely scriptural character of the pamphlet. Its author has indeed been privileged "to drink" copiously "of the well of" revelation "undefiled." *Having known God, or rather, been known of God,* (Gal. iv. 9,) *out of the abundance of his heart his mouth hath spoken.* (Matt. xii. 34.) God alone, he is satisfied, can teach the knowledge of his own character, and impart information respecting his purposes of grace and mercy towards the guilty children of men. And all that can be learned in reference to these topics, is contained in the infallible record. To God's word, therefore, our author at once and exclusively repairs. Its statements, reasonings, promises, and threatenings, he brings under the notice of his readers. Not in a dry, scholastic, and abstract form, but as nearly as possible in the language of Holy Writ itself. *Spiritual things he compares with spiritual.* 1 Cor. ii. 13. Spiritual language he makes to be its own sole interpreter. And he evinces, at every step, that he knows what he is speaking about. How refreshing the perusal of such a treatise!

Secondly. Possessed naturally, as Mr. Waldie is, of a clear and perspicuous intellect, what he has been given to understand, he is able always to express in neat and luminous phraseology. There is no straining on his part after superfine diction. Nothing of that *euphuism* which Sir Walter Scott has so happily ridiculed. No ambition to shine as a dialectician or rhetorician. *No darkening of counsel by words without knowledge.* Plain truths our author endeavours to enunciate, and does enunciate, in plain words. Simple, however, as his style is, it is not careless or slovenly. The *simplex munditiis* of Horace is perfectly applicable to it. It is a beautifully fitting vehicle for the transmission to the minds of others, of the glorious truths which have already obtained a place in his own. We actually forget our author's style, when absorbed in his subject. Is not this the perfection of writing?

Quitting general remarks, however, we descend at once to particulars.

Mr. Waldie's tract is divided into eight sections. Knowing, as he does, that the Scriptures are addressed to, as they are capable of being understood only by believers of the gospel—a fact, which, independently of other and profounder considerations, any one may verify for himself, by looking at the headings of most of the Epistles, and observing the expressive motto, *He that hath ears to hear, let him hear,* Matt. xiii. 9—he begins by showing what is the gospel, and who are believers in its cheering message. What the knowledge of the truth introduces believers to, and sketches of the history of the gospel past and present, next follow appropriately in order of succession. Two sections are occupied by these subjects. Some objections to preceding statements are then in a very masterly manner disposed of. Having thus laid the foundations of his theory deep in the Scriptures themselves, our author proceeds to his principal object. Section fifth having explained, by a reference to God's word, what the salvation of the gospel signifies, the remaining three sections are devoted expressly and exclusively to the question of Universal Salvation. Thoroughly sifted the subject is. No objection of any moment, but meets with its appropriate and satisfactory refutation. A postscript, and a most useful Appendix, consisting of

two parts, close the work. One is astonished at the mass of matter which our author has managed to condense within the limits of sixty duodecimo pages. His pamphlet is at once elementary, and a compend or digest of the subject of which it treats. In both respects it is admirable; especially in the latter. It is the doctrine of Universal Salvation, considered and discussed in the narrowest possible compass, not on human, but divine principles; it is an abstract, not so much of what preceding writers have said, as of views taken originally and directly from *the lively oracles* themselves. We hesitate not to say, that it is the most perfect, because as already stated, it is the most scriptural and perspicuous treatise, in vindication and illustration of God's boundless love to mankind, through Christ Jesus, now extant.

Certainly not the largest and fullest, not the most learned, eloquent, logical, comprehensive or profound. On mere literary grounds, it yields and yields cheerfully to productions of a higher grade. It is merely as a simple and characteristic expression of the mind of God on a particular subject, that it challenges competition. Does any believer of the gospel hesitate to assent to this? Let him, then, with a view to the satisfaction of his own mind, take up almost at random, and examine, some of the works which are most commonly appealed to as of standard merit in this controversy. For instance, Chauncy's "Salvation of All Men;"* Winchester's "Dialogues;" or Huntington's† "Calvinism Improved." Struck he will be no doubt at the great ability displayed in these various productions; but will he not be conscious also of something defective—of something radically wrong—of statements which cannot be reconciled with the discoveries of God's word, and reasons which flatly contradict its premises and conclusions, in all of them. The learning and copious scripture quotations of Chauncy cannot disguise his Pelagianism—through Winchester's eloquence, and earnestly glowing periods, his Arminian leanings are but too apparent—and the Puritanic Calvinism of Dr. Huntington renders many of his positions absolutely repulsive and revolting. The result will be the same, to whatever other quarters the enquirer may betake himself. Origen's conjectural and hesitating mode of stating his sentiments does not approve itself to any spiritually enlightened mind, as the manner of one who, backed by Scripture, has learned to speak with authority. Dr. Thomas Burnet's speculations regarding *things which are unseen*;‡ Bishop Newton's posthumous dissertation, in which he is found, like Tillotson, contending for divine threatenings, which it was never God's purpose to execute, and advocating the repentance of the wicked in hell; and the Chevalier Ramsay's "Philosophical Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion," a work as much Platonic as Christian, will be no more satisfactory, as more or less substituting man's hypotheses and conjectures for God's revealed truth. And modern American Universalism, in its rejection of our blessed Lord's deity and atonement, and its conversion of the regenerating and new-creative efficacy of Christ's resurrection into a mere improvement of human nature, will create disgust, as little else than a tissue of Anti-Christian abominations. It is true, that in Stonehouse's profound and learned "Restitution of All Things, a Scripture Doctrine"—in the well-known work of Jeremiah White, characterised by so much masculine logic, and expansiveness of mind, as well as thrilling eloquence—and in the simple and pious, but astute lucubrations of Neil Douglas, our enquirer will meet with more to admire, and from them will derive a larger measure of edification. Still, after perusing even such works, he will be conscious of something more scriptural—something more agreeable to the revealed testimony of Jehovah—being desirable. We want to get out of the region of human metaphysics, and scholastic subtleties altogether. We want to hear God himself addressing us on this most momentous subject. While we readily acknowledge the great merits of the authors to whom allusion has just been made, and of many others besides—while we admire their genius, are

* So ably assailed by J. Edwards, D. D., in his "Salvation of All Men strictly examined." 1787.
† Joseph Huntington, D. D., not William Huntingdon, S. S.
‡ De statu mortuorum.

profited by their learning, and would not choose to have foregone the perusal of their writings—we still ask in the name of our supposed Christian enquirer, is there nothing to be met with more consonant with the simplicity and *analogy of faith*, than their speculations? In Mr. Waldie's tract, the *desideratum* is supplied. Brief as it is, he brings under our notice in it, in such a way as to satisfy us, God's own system of Universal Salvation, as nearly as possible in God's own language.

The great secret of Mr. Waldie's success in his treatment of the doctrine of God's universal love, lies in the state of his mind, and the nature of his religious experience, previously to his having been led to receive and write about it. From the very first, religion seems to have made its way into his understanding and conscience, directly and almost exclusively from the Scriptures. In its progressive development to him, by the statements of the inspired volume, so far as he was acquainted with them, he seems to have been guided and regulated. And thus, long before apprehending the truth of the dogma which he now advocates, he was no novice in divine things. *The word of God dwelt in him* somewhat *richly*. Besides, the works of John Walker, of Dublin, had not been consulted and studied by him in vain. Early in his religious career, these had come under his notice. Immensely useful did he find them to be, seeing that to the Scriptures—*to the law and the testimony*—they constantly and exclusively make their appeal. Keen, searching and discriminating—capable of wielding *the two-edged sword*, so as *to pierce to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit*, Heb. iv. 12, as well as to lay bare the most refined delusions of the human mind, and the deepest-seated corruptions of the human heart—Walker is in his works, from first to last, practically enforcing our Lord's words, *Take heed what ye hear*, Mark iv. 24, and the congenial precept of the apostle, *Beloved, believe not every spirit*. 1 John iv. 1. Taught thus from Scripture many fundamental truths, and habituated in the school of Walker to take no religious principle upon trust, nothing claiming to be divine was likely to command Mr. Waldie's assent as an article of faith, unless it could bear to be subjected to the most minute biblical sifting and scrutiny; and unless it was capable of harmonizing, and taking its place with other truths, already by divine teaching ascertained and understood. To sacrifice a single fact revealed in God's infallible testimony, to any theory however plausible, and by whatever weight of human authority and argument supported, was, in our author's estimate of things, altogether out of the question. Add to all this, that Mr. Waldie had for years been prejudiced against, and adverse to the doctrine of Universal Salvation. It had appeared to him to contradict the word of God. He had felt that, as commonly taught, it was impossible to reconcile it with views which, in the light of Scripture, he had seen to be heavenly and divine. Such was his preparation for looking at this all-important subject, when circumstances forced it upon his regard. And his mode of procedure was what, considering the state of mind thus engendered and existing, might have been anticipated. Universal Salvation as claiming to be divine, by the only standard of divine truth behoved to be tried. Opposed as it appeared to him to be to the Scriptures, only in consequence of the Scriptures being found to teach and enforce it, could his deep-rooted opposition to it be overcome. And in applying the scriptural test, he had the advantage of being already well acquainted with the general principles of divine revelation—of possessing a clear and comprehensive view of many of its bearings on faith and practice, and of being influenced by a feeling of habitual submissiveness to whatever *God the Lord* might think proper *to speak*. Ps. lxxxv. 8. A state of things this, most favourable to truth, and most unfavourable to falsehood. It was not the sceptical human mind prepared, as in the case of the Vidlers, in England, and the Ballous, in America, to sacrifice notions lightly and traditionally taken up, to notions more accordant to the fleshly systems and reasonings of man; but it was the mind, to a certain degree divinely taught, and thereby rendered sceptical as to mere human theories of religion, led to seek for higher religious instruction at the fountain of divine

inspiration itself. *What saith the Scripture?* was Mr. Waldie's sole query. For man he well knew could give him no information whatever on the subject. Is Universal Salvation in the Word of God proclaimed? Not merely in the way of inference, but in direct and explicit terms? The question was not, Is it liable to objections from human ingenuity, or from mistaken views of Scripture? but, Has God declared it? If he has, then well did our author know that the matter was settled; and that with whatever difficulties the doctrine might at first be surrounded, in due time he would be enabled to see it, as divine, to be in harmony and consistent with every other truth which God had seen meet to reveal. His mental attitude was thus, not that of one who had determined to subject the Scriptures to his preconceived notions, but of one desirous to have his mind, in spite of every prejudice, brought into subjection to the Scriptures. The result is most interesting. *Searching the Scriptures*, like *the noble Bereans* of old, to *see whether these things were so*, he discovered that God's love to Adam's race, as a whole, through Christ Jesus, was a revealed truth; and, *therefore, he believed.* See Acts xvii. 11, 12. *The living God, who is specially the Saviour of them that believe*, was, he saw, on exactly the same authority on which that fact is made known, declared to be also *the Saviour of all men.* 1 Tim. iv. 10. Constrained by the force of the same heavenly testimony, which had satisfied him that *Jesus was the Christ*, Acts xviii. 28, and that *believing in* his death and resurrection as such, he *was born of God*, partaking of righteousness and life everlasting with him, 1 John v. 1, he became satisfied also, that *as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive*, 1 Cor. xv. 22, that *as by the offence of one man, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all even unto justification of life*, Rom. v. 18, and that *the purpose for* which *the Son of God was manifested* was in all cases *to destroy*, and in no case whatever to confirm and perpetuate sin and death, *the works of the devil.* 1 John iii. 8. The doctrines of God's election of his church, the privileges of believers, the constraining influence of love upon their hearts, and the self-denying and crucifying efficacy of this heavenly and divine principle,—all in the light of this newly-discovered truth, became to him more and more luminously apparent. Fleshly-minded men, on embracing some human system of universalism, have generally abandoned such views, if previously professed by them; in Mr. Waldie's case, as views that were divine, and as divinely taught, additional divine discoveries tended but to confirm and enlarge them. The words of our blessed Lord in his case received ample verification:—*If any man will do* God's *will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God.* John vii. 17. Need we wonder, if one thus led, and thus taught—taught almost exclusively by God's own word—should have been privileged to surpass in the simplicity and accuracy of his views of Universal Salvation, other thinkers and writers on the same subject? James Nicol, of Cummock, author of a little tract on God's Universal Love, published some years ago, is almost the only other specimen of the same kind, known to us. In the case of neither, has the doctrine, in the making known of which both now glory, been lightly, or at random taken up. With both, it is simply matter of faith. In the view of both, so far from superseding other doctrines revealed in the divine testimony, it merely takes its place along with them. And in this view of both, as a revealed truth, it belongs to the church, and not to the world. What, upon God's authority, they have been privileged to see and believe, both have committed to writing: treating scripturally, and therefore satisfactorily, of what they themselves have been taught scripturally. Not tendering to their readers mere human speculations, but, as far as they have been enabled, setting before them divine verities.

Nothing can be conceived more modest and unobtrusive than the manner in which Mr. Waldie launches out his little barque, freighted with better than Californian gold, into the waters of religious strife. It is not after having qualified himself by previous academic training, and provided himself with every species of weapon offensive and defensive, that, like one of the knights

of old, he boldly rushes into the arena of controversy, and, having thrown down the gauntlet, bids defiance to every foe. His way of procedure is the very reverse of all this. Quietly and unostentatiously does he come forward in the capacity of an author. Having discovered Universal Salvation to be one of the truths taught in God's word, and having been satisfied of its unspeakable importance as part of the heavenly message, he invites fellow believers, who may be opposed to his views of the subject, or who may labour under doubts respecting them, to sit down, along with him, to a calm and dispassionate study of the inspired and infallible testimony. To its decision he proposes to submit their mutual differences. By its statements, as conclusive, he professes himself ready to abide. In fact, his is one of the most unpretending, one of the least dogmatic, controversial treatises, both as to matter and manner, which, in the whole course of our reading, we recollect ever to have met with. Mr. Waldie comes forward in no professional capacity. He makes no parade of human learning. He claims no authority—no right to dictate—even on the score of his having studied the subject more, and understanding it better than others. No airs of any kind does he put on. He is merely a Christian man, desirous to address, and to be listened to by Christian men, in reference to one of the most important of revealed topics. Surely a work like this, in which scriptural truth is upheld and enforced in so scriptural a temper and spirit, even were its literary merits far inferior to what they are, might well prefer a claim to our careful perusal, and serious regard.

Our author's view of sin is to us most satisfactory, because most agreeable to the language and principles of Holy Writ. He beholds sin, in the light of man's sufferings and death, in the light of the exclusion of the unregenerate from the pure and heavenly kingdom of God, and above all, in the light of the cross of Christ Jesus, God's eternal and well-beloved Son, to be exceedingly hateful in God's sight;* while, at the same time, seeing it put away by our Lord's atoning sacrifice, he does not ascribe to it a character of exaggeration, unwarranted by Scripture. Instead of his tract evincing a "tendency to a kind of high Calvinism, which leads those who adopt it to lose sight of the great truth which the apostolic gospel is adapted to convey, God's hatred of sin," and to "look on the death and resurrection of Christ as something of quite subsidiary importance"—a charge of tendency which, whether truly or not, has been recently in our pages brought against another writer on the subject of God's Universal Love—sin as hateful in God's sight, Mr. Waldie is desirous and careful to show, becomes increasingly offensive, as they increasingly know and are increasingly influenced by *the truth as it is in Jesus*, in the sight of God's believing people; and to the death and resurrection of Christ alone they ascribe the ending of sin and death, and the enjoyment of every spiritual and heavenly blessing: it being clear to them, through faith, that in the revealed facts of *Christ having died for our sins, according to the Scriptures*, and of his having destroyed death by *rising again from the dead on the third day, according to the Scriptures*, 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4, all true and divine doctrines are summed up, and the foundation of all true and divine religion is laid.† This is as it should be. *Sin, exceeding sinful*, Rom. vii. 13, and yet sin atoned for, John i. 29. The cross of Christ the true, because divine measure of sin's enormity; and yet the cross of Christ, as showing sin *cast* behind God's back, even *into the depths of the sea*, Micah vii. 19, speaking peace to the guilty conscience of the sinner, Eph. ii. 14, 15; Heb. xii. 24. God, through the instrumentality of that cross, *killing and making alive*; Deut. xxxii. 39; God in that cross manifested *as just*, and the *justifier of the ungodly*. Rom. iii. 26; iv. 5. We love Mr. Waldie for the beautiful and Christian simplicity with which he has treated of this subject. Rather, we love the truth which he has been privileged so scripturally to

* That is, God's nature is in a state of fixed, unalterable, and essential opposition to sin.—See Gal. v. 17.

† We would particularly refer, as illustrative of our author's views on this subject, to his beautiful and condensed note on page 46.

proclaim, and *glorify God in him.* Gal. i. 24. When will writers on the subject of Christianity, in treating of the nature and deserts of sin, learn to exhibit more of the views and spirit of the religion which they confess? Not, on the one hand, detracting from sin's evil and accursed nature, by supposing the possibility of any mere creature sufferings and death—of anything short of *the blood of God**—to have been capable of expiating it; and not, on the other, rushing into Manicheism, by ascribing to sin *infinitude:* thereby, besides elevating it to the rank of a divine attribute, destroying the possibility of its being taken away.† Our author has been enabled by scriptural, that is, divine teaching, to avoid both extremes. Sin is indefinite, and therefore beyond the power of the creature to destroy; sin is not infinite, and therefore, by the infinite Creator manifest in flesh, was destroyed. Sin is hateful to God, and the fitting and certain subject of punishment in those by whom it is committed: but God's hatred of it is not displayed, as is imagined by popular religionists, in his conferring upon sinful beings, and thereby upon sin itself, everlasting existence,—in his everlastingly and ineffectually struggling with sin by his everlasting torments of sinners, and in thus keeping sin in his sight and before his presence for ever; on the contrary, it is displayed in his destruction of sin through the death of sinners, in his swallowing up of sin in divine righteousness in the cross of Christ Jesus, and in his new creation of the victims of sin, after his own heavenly and divine image, through the power of his Son's resurrection, all terminating in the utter and everlasting obliteration of sin from the universe. Ps. civ. 35; Heb. ii. 14, ix. 26; 1 John iii. 8. Also, 1 Cor. xv. 26; Rev. i. 18, xx. 14, and xxi. 3—5.

Several extracts from this little work, had space permitted, we should have been delighted to give. Let the following one suffice. While it is a clear statement of some of the grounds upon which the doctrine of Universal Salvation rests, it affords also a favourable specimen of the simplicity of our author's style, and of the thoroughly scriptural character of the ideas with which his mind is imbued:—

"Let us direct our attention to the various announcements of the gospel, and consider what is implied in them.—The first was made in the curse denounced against the serpent, the enmity which was foretold between his seed and the seed of the woman, and the result of that hostility: that while the former should bruise the heel, the latter should bruise the head of his foe: (Gen. iii. 15) indicating, not obscurely, that while the triumph of the former should be partial, that of the latter should be complete; and this was fulfilled when the Son of God became a partaker of flesh and blood, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil. (Heb. ii. 14.) But surely it were absurd to say, that this victory is exhibited in Christ's saving a few from death, while the great majority of the human race are left victims of the power of the serpent, nay, more than that, everlasting monuments of his triumph!—Then again, when the gospel was announced to Abraham under the promise of God's making of his seed a great nation, and of giving them the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession, it was declared by God that he would make him a father of many nations, and that in him all families of the earth should be blessed. (Gen. xii. 2, 3, xviii. 18, xxii. 18.) And we cannot understand by this, that only a few out of the families shall be blessed. His earthly posterity have long been the objects of God's wrath, not of his blessing, which has been transferred to his true promised seed, even to that one seed, whom, on account of his obedience, God hath highly exalted, that at his name every knee should bow, and every tongue confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. (Phil. ii. 8—11.) But how can this be effected, except by all being brought to a knowledge of that truth,

* This we write advisedly. *The church of God which he has purchased with his own blood.* Otherwise, *the church of the Lord.* Besides, Κυρίου Θεοῦ, Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ, Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου, Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ, and Χριστοῦ. Dr. John Pye Smith, in this country, and a host of commentators foreign and British, have critically examined this passage. Admirably, and on the whole impartially, is the question stated and argued in Porter's "Principles of Textical Criticism," pp. 473—482. While the manuscript authority in favour of *Church of the Lord* must be confessed to be exceedingly strong, and while the sense of the passage is not materially affected by reading either "God," or "Lord," we cannot see that the evidence in favour of "Lord" preponderates, and consequently, feel no inclination to disturb the rendering which our translators, in the exercise of a sound discretion, saw meet to adopt.

† One infinite cannot supersede another.

which is even now communicated to his chosen people, and which to them is life eternal?—And when in the fulness of time that seed of Abraham came in flesh, now was it announced?—as glad tidings of great joy, which should be to all people. (Lune ii. 10.) His herald announced him as the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world, (John i. 29,) and proclaimed respecting his work, that all flesh should see the salvation of God. (Luke iii. 6.) And the Holy Spirit testified respecting the purpose of his coming, that God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved; (John iii. 17;) and this, because he *so loved the world.* (v. 16). And in accordance with these, an apostle declares, that we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world (1 John iv. 14): it being the purpose of his humiliation, that he should taste death for all (Heb ii. 9). Moreover, the same thing is declared in connection with the salvation of believers; pointing out plainly that salvation will ultimately extend beyond those who have a knowledge of it now: for God *our* Saviour willeth that all men be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth, through the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time, (or a testimony in the appropriate seasons) (1 Tim. ii. 3—6).* And the living God is the Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe (1 Tim. iv. 10); and again, Jesus Christ is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world. (1 John ii. 2.) Believers rejoice now in the knowledge of that which all shall know hereafter; for with the apostle they can say, Blessed be God, who hath blessed us in Christ, in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace; wherein he hath abounded towards us in all wisdom and prudence; having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he had purposed in himself; that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one (re-head or unite in one head) *all things* in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him; in whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will. (Eph. i. 7—11.) They rejoice in their own salvation, not as the end of God's work, but as the earnest of that purpose which will be completely fulfilled only in the salvation of all."—Ultimate Manifestation, pp. 30—32.

So interesting to us is Mr. Waldie's tract, and so edifying the views of the divine character which it discloses, that we find we could expatiate on it and them to an extent, which neither the limits prescribed to us, nor the patience of our readers would tolerate.

Suffice it in conclusion to say, that while the work to which we are now adverting will never set aside other writings on the same subject, supersede the necessity of our prosecuting our researches at greater length and more profoundly than its author has done, and prevent even more enlarged and accurate scriptural views than his from being at some future period of the Church introduced, yet as the most scriptural manual of the doctrine of Universal Salvation at present in existence, a previous acquaintance with its contents will eminently qualify and prepare believers of the truth for entering on the examination of what others have published, for a better understanding and appreciation of their respective systems, and for detecting the numerous errors and fallacies into which they have been betrayed, and by which the ignorant and simple-minded are so apt to be led astray.

D. T.

ON MATTHEW V. 44, 45.

"COMMON mercies must be valued as instances and proofs of the goodness of God, who in them shows himself a bountiful Benefactor to the whole world of mankind, who would be very miserable without these favours, and are utterly unworthy of the least of them." Henry.

This, however, Partialists tell us, is the whole of his bounty to a vast majority. The Psalmist says, "his *anger* is but for a moment;" but they tell us, that this is to believers, and that to all others his *favour* is but for a moment,

---

* Το μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίοις. Cujus testimonium *temporibus suis* confirmatum est. Vulg. Of which the testimony is *in its proper season.*—Mac Knight, *in loco.* Why, professing as the eminent critic just named did to "translate literally from the original Greek," and stating in his note on the text that "in this translation" he had followed "the vulgate," has he not given us as the common language of both, *in their proper seasons?* (Note by Reviewer.)

and his anger merciless and endless. Hence we infer either that the imitation here commanded requires the same *inverse proportion*, or that Partialism is false. To the same purpose Paul—

"Be not overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good." Rom. xii. 21.

The inferences here are, as God requires us to imitate him, that this, and not the contrary, is his manner of dealing with his creatures; and, as Omnipotence cannot be defeated, that this dealing will necessarily issue in the abolition of all evil.

R. R.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

Sir,—The 12th verse of the 4th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, speaking of Jesus Christ, reads thus:—

"Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we *must* be saved."

A great number of the preachers in this town quote the verse in the following manner:—

"Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we *may* be saved." Sometimes they substitute the word *can;* in only one instance have I heard it quoted correctly, *must* be saved; excepting by the Rev. Wm. Seabrook, late of this place. Can you give me a reason for this? Is it because they have a particular purpose to serve? as hinted in the following remarks by Dr. Adam Clarke, found in his Commentary on the 18th verse of the 5th chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans: "The Greek text of this verse is as follows—which, literally rendered, stands thus—*Therefore as by one offence unto all men, unto condemnation; so likewise, by one righteousness unto all men, to justification of life.* This is evidently an elliptical sentence, and its *full* meaning can be gathered only from the context. He who had *no particular purpose to serve* would most probably understand it from the context thus—*Therefore, as by one sin all men came into condemnation; so also by one righteous act all men came unto justification of life;* which is more fully expressed in the following verse. Now leaving all particular *creeds* out of the question, and taking in the scope of the Apostle's reasoning in this and the preceding chapter, is not the sense evidently this? Through the disobedience of Adam, a sentence of condemnation to death, without any promise or hope of a resurrection, passed upon all men; so by the obedience of Christ unto death, this one grand righteous act, the sentence was so far reversed, that death shall not *finally* triumph, for all shall again be restored to life. *Justice* must have its due; and therefore all must *die.* The *mercy* of God in Christ Jesus shall have its due also; and therefore all shall be put into a *salvable* state here, and the whole human race shall be raised to *life* at the great day. Thus both *justice* and *mercy* are magnified; and neither is exalted at the expense of the other."

Your kind insertion of the above will, I trust, be the means of causing preachers to make quotations correctly, and not endeavour to weaken the meaning of the Scriptures, as is too frequently the case, when God's love to the whole of Adam's race is spoken of.

Believe me, truly yours,

Plymouth, 13th May, 1850. A. O. Z.

[The word in Acts iv. 12, is δει, It occurs 105 times, and is nowhere translated *may* or *can,* even in the common version; the substitution of which for *must* seems to countenance A. O. Z.'s suspicion, that it is "to serve a particular purpose." Dr. Adam Clarke's literal translation of Rom. v. 18 is correct: but his commentary on it seems no less intended "to serve a particular purpose"—"came into condemnation," and "came unto justification," express *certainties;* but in the place of the latter certainty, he puts "*salvable* state," which is only *possible salvation,* and consequently, justice (if, in this case, it can be called justice,) *is* exalted at the expense of mercy. Another writer says to the same purpose, "Salvation through Christ is offered to the whole human family, and is therefore correlative with the ruin of the fall."—*Davidson's Introduction to the New Testament.* vol. ii. p. 201. *Offered* salvation a correlative with *actual* ruin! Such is the reasoning of all our opponents, however they may disagree on other points. But even this is saying too much, an immense majority having never heard of any such offer; so that, under error, in this case, of a deceptive verbosity, we are seriously required to believe that + = —, or 1 = 0, is an equation.—Ed.]

THE UNIVERSALIST.

AUGUST, 1850.

AN EXPLANATION OF THE TERMS AND PHRASES SUPPOSED TO EXPRESS THE PLACE OR PUNISHMENT OF ENDLESS TORMENT IN THE NEXT LIFE.

1. *Unquenchable fire* is applied to *literal destruction by fire*, as in Jer. xvii. 27 ; or is symbolically used for *excision by the sword*, as in Ezek. xx. 45—49, explained in xxi. 1—5 ; or, it may be, for any other *destructive judgment*, as in Isaiah i. 31 ; lxvi. 24 ; Jer. iv. 4 ; vii. 20 ; Amos v. 6.

2. *Everlasting fire* is symbolically used for *temporal judgment protracted through a series of ages ;* as appears from its application in Jer. xvii. 4, to that inflicted on the Jews by the Romans, under the consequences of which they are still suffering.

3. *Hades* is a term for "the state of the dead in general, without regard to the goodness or badness of the persons, their happiness or misery." This explanation, given by Dr. Campbell, Principal of Marishall College, Aberdeen, is generally admitted. The term is, with one exception, translated *hell* in all the passages of the New Testament containing it, which are as follow : Matt. xi. 23, xvi. 18 ; Luke x. 15, xvi. 23 ; Acts ii. 27, 31 ; 1 Cor. xv. 55 ; Rev. i. 18, vi. 8, xx. 13, 14. Of these, Luke xvi. 23 is that most commonly produced in support of the popular opinion ; but the whole passage is explained by Lightfoot, Whitby, and others, as a parable, signifying the change of condition effected, at the close of the Mosaic dispensation, between the Jews and Gentiles. Lightfoot even ridicules the literal acceptation of it.

4. *Gehenna* is literally the *Valley of Hinnom*, south east of Jerusalem, symbolically used by Jeremiah, vii. 32—34, and xix, in predicting the judgment inflicted by the Romans, and circumstantially related by Josephus. It is always translated *hell*, and the following are all the passages containing it : Matt. v. 22, 29, 30, x. 28, xviii. 9, xxiii. 15, 33 ; Mark ix. 43, 45, 47 ; Luke xii. 5 ; James iii. 6. In common with the figurative passages which speak of an *axe*, *fire*, *furnace of fire*, *&c.* they all refer to the numerous prophetic denunciations against consummated Jewish apostacy, particularly those already noticed in Jeremiah ; and, as a further proof of their temporal nature, it is remarkable, that

the *judgment of Gehenna* is never threatened to the Gentiles; and that all the discourses of our Lord, in which the term occurs, are omitted in John's Gospel, apparently because written for the use of the Gentiles.

5. *Tartarised*, or *cast into Tartarus.* I adopt Mr. Balfour's reasons for thinking that "the angels" mentioned in 2 Pet. ii. 4, and in Jude 6, were Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, with their company; and that the phrases "tartarised and delivered into chains of darkness," or "reserved in everlasting chains under darkness," express their peculiar punishment as recorded in Num. xvi. 32, 33. It is there said that "the earth opened her mouth and swallowed them up," and that they went down alive into שאול. This word, in Greek ἅδης, has more extension than קבר, the *grave* or *sepulchre*, because applied to those who were not, as well as to those who were buried. It therefore generally expresses an abstraction; but, as all that is visible of man descends, when buried, into the earth, it is sometimes used as an appellation for a supposed locality. See Isaiah xiv. 9—20; Ezek. xxxii. 17—32; Luke xvi. 23. The word *tartarized* includes this use of שאול, and occurs nowhere else.

These "angels" are said to be "reserved in everlasting (etaneous) chains, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day." Jude 6. Having proved, in former articles, that the New Testament speaks of but one day of judgment, now long past, the passage requires a coincident explanation. It apparently alludes to our Lord's denunciation, "All these things," all the things previously mentioned, "shall come upon this generation." Matt. xxiii. 36. All the wickedness of former ages was thus summed up in the enormity of theirs: in particular, the rejection of Moses and Aaron was antitypically re-acted in the far more atrocious rejection of Christ and his apostles; and Peter and Jude might therefore well speak of it as involved in darkness, till fully manifested in the signal judgment about to be inflicted on it.

This explanation receives much support from Psalm cxl. 10, "Let burning coals fall upon them: let them be cast into the fire; into deep pits, that they rise not up again." The word rendered *deep pits*, says Parkhurst, "seems probably to mean *breaches* and disruptions of the earth, as in an earthquake; for the whole verse is an evident allusion to the punishment of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and of the two hundred and fifty men who burnt incense." Horsley is of the same opinion, and entitles the whole Psalm, "A BELIEVER'S PRAYER FOR PROTECTION AGAINST THE ATHEISTICAL FACTION"—which believer and faction are undoubtedly Christ and the apostate Jews. See Luke xxiv. 44.

6. *The lake of fire.* Rev. xix. 20, xx. 10, 14, 15, xxi. 8. The whole passage is figurative; and Hug, though a believer in hell, so expounds it. As Gehenna symbolized the destruction of Jerusalem, so the lake of fire, by a similar allusion to the Lake Asphaltides, or Dead Sea, the scene and memorial of the fiery destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, appears to symbolize the last and most signal judgment of prophecy; being that which overthrew the power of heathen Rome, the most idolatrous, impious, merciless, and hostile to God and godliness, to Christ and Christianity, that ever corrupted and desolated the earth. It is called "the second death." The first death was the Adamic: the second, the Mosaic, annexed to the rejection of Christ (Deut. xxx. 11—20); in which, after the preaching of the gospel, the Gentiles were

involved, (Rom. x. 4—18, xi. 22 ; 1 Pet. iv. 17,) and of which the infliction on both Jews and Gentiles is affirmed by our Lord in his combined application of two special prophecies of Isaiah and Daniel to himself and them. Isaiah viii. 13, 14 ; Dan. ii. 34, 35 ; Matt. xxi. 44. The passage, Rev. xx. from ver. 11 to 15, refers to the great session and judgment described, with or without figure, in many other places, particularly in Dan. ii. 31—45, vii. 9—14 ; Matt. xxv. 31—46 : Acts xvii. 31 ; Rev. iii. 10 ; which has established, by verified prediction, once for all and for ever, the spiritual independence of Christ and his saints : so that, however heathen or nominally Christian governments may usurp the throne of God, by legislating in things which belong solely to God, their enactments are null, void, and destitute of authority, in the court of heaven and of conscience. Matt. xxii. 21 ; Acts iv. 19.

The lake of fire, (however the name may have originated,) being thus shown to symbolize a long-past visitation in this world, cannot signify a *place* in another.

R. R.

TRUE CHRISTIANITY A PRACTICAL RELIGION.

ARTICLE III.

We now proceed, according to the purpose expressed in the preceding articles, to endeavour to elucidate the causes of the apparent insufficiency of the sanctions and influences of Christianity on human conduct. These may be traced to two causes, ignorance of what true Christianity is, and ignorance of what it teaches ; in the one case ignorance of what the new covenant is from the perversion of the testimony which declares it ; in the other case ignorance of what it teaches, from inattention to its precepts ; and this generally arising from some erroneous sentiment more or less inconsistent with the gospel itself, proceeding from the imperfect and carnal nature of those who profess it. The former of these causes will first require our attention.

It is obvious that if a doctrine be misunderstood, the principles imparted by that doctrine cannot exist in the individuals who so misunderstand it ; the deficiency of the consequences anticipated from such principles, or the existence of other and different ones, are only apparently attributable to the doctrine professed, inasmuch as they are really the consequences of something else. It becomes therefore of the greatest importance, when a doctrine is professed, to enquire whether it is really understood, or whether some other sentiments are not held, in reality essentially different. And this is pre-eminently the case in regard to the gospel, which is misunderstood and perverted in innumerable ways, and in the most diverse and apparently opposite forms.

In our first article we adverted to two grand divisions of spurious Christianity, under which all false gospels may be classified ; the one recognizing a Deity benevolent and merciful, but liable to be counteracted by his own creatures ; the other a God wise and good, but under the control of a stern necessity or fate. The first of these is calculated

to be the most generally acceptable and popular ; the second is usually modified to a greater or less extent by the former view ; and both have practical tendencies and bear their appropriate fruits.

All who profess the gospel understand it in some way as a declaration of God's mercy, or at least benevolence, to man. It exhibits God as giving, or at least offering or expressing his willingness to give, benefits to man. It is expressed in the words that God sent his Son into the world to save sinners ; and so it is received by all, whatever be the meaning they attach to the words. But this meaning in the vast majority of cases is something very different from the true one.

Some understand by saving sinners, simply showing them how they may save themselves from the consequences of transgressing the divine law. As they conceive men capable of doing so, they perceive no difficulty in one having done so, and thus pointed out the way to others ; and as man has been created by God after his own image, they readily recognize this perfect individual as entitled to the appellation of the well-beloved Son of God. He taught men what was well-pleasing and acceptable to God, both by precept and example ; he suffered patiently and without murmuring the calumnies and persecutions of those he came to seek and to save,—suffered even to the death, giving an example for the encouragement and support of his disciples ; he was raised from the dead to manifest his acceptance with God, and to show that death was not the destiny of man ; and he was taken up into heaven to give evidence that a higher and better life was to be the reward of man's obedience and good works upon earth. All this was to point out how much was within man's power, to encourage him to exert himself to attain to that which one had gained, and which therefore others might gain also. The son of Joseph and Mary had raised himself from earth to heaven, and his brethren might do so likewise ; the blessing of their Heavenly Father would also attend their pious endeavours, his grace would not be wanting to assist them.

Such views naturally lead men to consider themselves as the equals of Jesus, his equals in kind at least, though it may be not in degree. They try to imitate his acts, and in some cases with no small success ; they aspire to exhibit meekness, patience, and forbearance, nay, even courage, fortitude, and magnanimity, like his, and when they succeed in some partial display, persuade themselves into the belief that they may equal in all. They avoid the appearance of evil, and put a guard upon their lips, and thus gain the approbation and commendation of their fellow-men. But this is not enough : they seek to gain the approbation of God : they know that he discerns the thoughts of the heart, and they direct their endeavours to attain to that purity of thought which characterized "the Lamb without spot." They aspire after a holiness or separation from sin which does not exist in humanity, and what they cannot find in reality they discover in their own fancy ; they try to be what they are not, and endeavour to attain to what they conceive to be a spiritual frame of mind,—some state of exalted feeling giving evidence that their thoughts, desires, and aspirations are superior to and better than those of others, or of their former selves. The tendency of their system is therefore to produce external correctness of conduct, and active benevolence towards others, along with a high degree

of self-deception and self-exaltation. Avowedly seeking to attain to heaven by their own efforts, they try to make God their debtor; it is true that they acknowledge themselves his creatures, and that to him they owe all they possess, but having got a seed of goodness to cultivate, it lies with themselves to develope it, and according as they bring forth fruit so will they reap the reward both in time and degree. Their gospel therefore is, that Christ came into the world to show sinners the best and speediest way to save themselves.

Others, more doubtful of their ability to gain heaven by their own natural powers, recognize in Jesus a being superior to themselves, who took man's obligations and man's sin upon himself, and by his own perfect obedience and his subjection to the punishment due to the violation of the law under which man was placed, satisfied God's justice. Man has thus found in Christ a substitute to satisfy the claims of the first law, and is now placed under a milder and easier system, less strict and exacting in its requirements, better accommodated to his fallen nature, and which, with the assistance of God's grace, it is within his power to fulfil. This grace he can also procure by sincerely and earnestly seeking it, so that it is entirely his own fault if he remain unsaved. The tendency of this doctrine is similar to that of the last, the chief difference being that it prompts its professors to look more without themselves for the means of attaining that spirituality they so much desire, and to be more zealous in the discharge of religious duties as the means of obtaining that divine assistance they so much require, which is so essential to the success of their own labours, and which so effectually secures that success. This system degrades the character of the Almighty, by exhibiting him as bringing down the demands of his law in subservience to the weakness of his creatures, thus repairing as well as he can, the imperfections of his own work. It is less suited to superior and educated minds than the last, but in various forms as regards its accessories, and more or less refined in its details, it is well suited to the mass, and has exercised a powerful influence on mankind. Its practical tendencies are more or less beneficial in proportion to its adherence to the precepts of the word of God; when the traditions of men have been substituted for these, it is often not a little pernicious. It tends also in a high degree to direct the attention of its professors to their own acts, words, and thoughts, and to look upon these as the means by which they are to escape from punishment and gain a heavenly reward. The gospel of these men is, that Christ came into the world to furnish the means whereby men may be able, if they choose to avail themselves of them, to save themselves.

Others, again, influenced by the plain language of the apostolic writings, repudiate verbally any dependance upon their own works, and profess to trust for salvation to divine mercy alone. The Son of God has made an atonement for sin—for all sin; and the demands of his justice being satisfied, God now proclaims his love to all: he is now in a position to be able to save all, or is willing, nay, even desirous or anxious, to save the whole world, if they will only be saved. He offers them eternal life if they will accept of it; entreats them to receive it; declares that he is reconciled to them if they will but believe it. His love is universal: man's depravity alone limits its operation, and brings

down justice on his head instead of mercy. Believing this declaration or accepting this offer, they will also receive grace without measure to enable them to walk worthy of the calling wherewith they are called. The great object of this system is therefore to arouse the conscience to a sense of guilt and danger; to show man his need for a Saviour; to arouse his feelings to an apprehension of the greatness of the divine benevolence; and to induce him in consequence to flee to Jesus for safety, to accept of his offered mercy, or to believe in his proclaimed gospel or glad tidings. The tendency of this system is to stimulate the feelings and to direct the attention of its professors to the examination of the state of their hearts towards God. Its practical influence is also powerful, leading men to look to their conduct as affording evidence of the state of their hearts—that on which their peace of mind depends. And as the conclusion so drawn, if made fairly, must always be unsatisfactory, its direct and inevitable tendency is to produce self-deception, to make men shut their eyes to the evidence of anything else than that they wish to see, and persuade themselves into the belief of the existence of what they wish to find; or in other cases, it may be, to distract them with doubts and fears, to harass them with apprehensions, or even to lead them to despair. The gospel of these men is, that Christ came into the world to put all men into a salvable state, and to effect that salvation in the case of all those who are desirous or even willing to be saved, or not so ill-disposed as to reject or neglect this salvation; or, in other words, to save well-disposed sinners.

Another class holds that Christ died for a portion of the human race —his own people, and for them alone; that as it is not revealed who these favoured individuals are, it is the duty of all alike to obey the command to believe the gospel or proclamation that Christ died for sinners; that only God's elected ones can and do believe this testimony, but that nevertheless all others to whom it is presented are guilty of the sin of unbelief or of the rejection of the truth, and are condemned for this unbelief because it springs from their evil heart; that those who believe the gospel are brought to this faith through the influence of the Holy Spirit, changing their hearts, convincing them of sin, and leading them to take hold of Christ or appropriate his salvation. The great object of this system is therefore to lead men to look to their own thoughts and feelings in order to discover whether they are convinced of sin, whether their hearts are changed, and whether their desires are directed towards God, in order that they may be able to conclude that they have laid hold on Christ, or appropriated his salvation, or at least are in a fair way of doing so. Then they find grounds for believing that they are amongst the number of God's elect, and then the apostolic proclamation *becomes* gospel or good news to them. And as they also maintain that this change of heart leads to change of conduct,—turning men from taking pleasure in their own ways to take pleasure in God's, and that their own imperfections can be remedied by the assistance of God's grace, given freely to those who ask it, this doctrine exercises an important practical influence, leading its professors to examine into their own thoughts and acts, as confirmatory evidence of conclusions they have already drawn from reflection on their own feelings. The tendency of this system is self-deceptive and pharisaical in a high

degree, inasmuch as it is more self-inconsistent than the other systems we have adverted to, and requires greater subtlety for its apprehension: it has also a greater tendency to produce doubts, fears, and despair. The gospel of these men is, that Christ came into the world to save some sinners, and that anyone may discover that he belongs to that favoured number if he only sincerely and earnestly try to believe it.

And there are still others who hold that Christ came into the world to save his own people—a certain number selected in God's sovereign purpose to be recipients of eternal life. Some private revelation, some internal discovery, or some fancied consciousness of their own spirituality satisfies them that they are of this favoured number. They require to look neither to their actions nor to their feelings to give them peace and hope, neither do they require to look to the actions or feelings of any other being for a ground of these. They may talk of the work of Jesus Christ as the source of their salvation, but in reality they regard only the purpose of God; and the mission of his Son stands with them only as that of one who came to proclaim generally what they, in some way or other, discover the special application of to themselves, the only thing to them of real value. The obedience unto death of the Son of God attracts but little of their attention, and excites but little of their admiration or gratitude: it is in words part of their system, but it might as well have been absent. The consideration of their own favouritism is the Alpha and Omega of their system: they rejoice in their supposed knowledge that they are of the number of God's elect, or children of God, whom he has created for one destiny, while he has ordained the rest of mankind to another.

The practical effects of such a system are obvious. Justice and mercy are terms suggestive of feelings of very little comparative interest, as in reference to the highest of all relations—that with God they have no real application: the world is perishing and the elect are saved because God has willed it so: justice has as little to do with the one as love with the other; both alike are the results of the decree of an arbitrary will—a creative fate. As there is no source of satisfaction from the one, neither is there any spring of gratitude from the other. The professors of such systems do not require to look to their actions or their feelings, either to satisfy themselves that they are believers, or for the sake of others. The apostolic exhortations to walk worthy of the calling by which they are called are by them unheeded; they experience no gratitude, therefore appeals to them on such grounds are made in vain. They are not as other men are, and congratulate themselves upon this without even the Pharisee's profession of thanksgiving. They are ready to boast that they are saved from law, sin, and death, while in reality they are slaves to the lowest of laws—the law of their nature and the fear of public opinion, or of temporal inconvenience or suffering; slaves to sin, disregarding without scruple any expression of the will of God, if not supported by the voice of the society in which they live, or in accordance with their own inclinations; slaves to death, being ignorant of God's true character, and strangers to that love which springs from it, and is evidenced in those who have it by their keeping his commandments. The gospel of these men is, that Christ came into the world to save them, or to give them the means of knowing that they are the special favourites of heaven.

Such is a sketch of the principal ways in which the doctrine of salvation through Jesus Christ is misunderstood and perverted, and a glance at the practical results which flow from such perversions. The glad tidings of the mercy of God stands distinguished from all these by simply declaring that Christ came into the world to save sinners, even the chief; thus showing men that they are sinners and need salvation. It thus at once lays a foundation for the most lively gratitude, as the blessing proclaimed is the highest man can receive. It thus at once gives peace and joy to those who understand and believe it, for it shows a work finished by one able and willing to do it. It sends them to seek no evidence either in their acts or feelings of any state of mind proving that the salvation may be theirs, for it tells them as matter of fact that God is at peace with the guilty. It directs their thoughts from themselves to one worthy of them all, even the well-beloved Son of God; presenting to their view all divine perfections embodied in him; exhibiting to them God's character as manifested in his work. It shows the whole work of salvation accomplished by him, and no salvation possible without him; it leaves therefore not the slightest ground either for devout humility in seeking that salvation, nor for high-minded confidence in being possessed of it; it proclaims it to be God's *gift*, as certain as it is gratuitous, as undeserved as it is assured. The practical influence of this is to produce in those who know it love for him who first loved them, and to encourage and support them in showing the influence of that love in their practice, by the assurance of God's never-ceasing watchfulness over and unfailing care for them.

It is true that those who know and believe this doctrine, and are influenced by its principles, are still creatures of flesh and blood, influenced by that carnal mind which is essential to human nature, and bringing forth its appropriate fruits. And it would be difficult to say to how great an extent the existence of this mind may be evidenced in their conduct, or how little may be apparent as the effect of the principles implanted by the knowledge of the gospel. Only this we say, that so far as this is understood and unperverted, to that extent will such principles exist, and such will be the nature of their effects. In a great many cases where there is much talk about the gospel and little apparent influence exerted by it, it will be found on examination that the faith held is a perversion of the gospel,—some modification or variety of those perversions we have already indicated, or that there exists only a profession—an ability and propensity to talk about a system as an exercise of mental ingenuity, a thing perhaps true, or more probable, or more consistent, than other schemes, but of the certainty of which there is no decided conviction. This indeed is probably the state of mind of a vast majority of professors of all creeds, whether holding verbally the true gospel or any other of its more popular perversions. They cannot satisfy themselves that there is no truth in it, or they cannot shake off the suspicion (and it may be a very strong one) that there is truth in it; so, partly to satisfy themselves, partly to stand well with their neighbours, they frame for themselves or adopt some system which is the most likely thing they know of, but their conviction of the truth of which is not so strong as to influence them in cases where anything sufficiently disagreeable attends the carrying out of their principles into

practice, or any sufficiently strong temptation presents itself to induce them to gratify their own natural inclinations at the expense of these principles. In such a state of mind the influence of any professed faith must necessarily be feeble. Such was not the faith of the saints of old; such is not the faith of the people of God now. *They* are satisfied or convinced of the truth of what they profess; *they* believe with the heart or without doubt, and from *them* we may expect to see the fruits of faith,—principles manifested in practice. Yet even in these the appropriate effects are often very imperfect, and to the causes of these imperfections we shall next direct our attention.

D. W.

EXTRACT FROM LYELL'S "SECOND VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES OF NORTH AMERICA."

"Portland, with 15,000 inhabitants, is the principal city of Maine; gay and cheerful, with neat white houses, shaded by avenues of trees on each side of the wide streets, the bright sunny air unsullied, as usual in New England, by coal smoke. There are churches here of every religious denomination: Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists, Free-will Baptists, Universalists, Unitarians, Episcopalians, Roman Catholics, and Quakers, all living harmoniously together. The late Governor of the State was a Unitarian; and, as if to prove the perfect toleration of churches the most opposed to each other, they have recently had a Roman Catholic Governor."—[p. 48.]

"To account for the toleration prevailing in New England and the States chiefly peopled from thence, we must refer to a combination of many favourable circumstances, some of them of ancient date, and derived from the times of the first Puritan settlers. To these I shall have many opportunities of alluding in the sequel; but I shall mention now a more modern cause, the effect of which was brought vividly before my mind, in conversation with several lawyers of Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts, whom I fell in with on this tour. I mean the reaction against the extreme Calvinism of the church first established in this part of America, a movement which has had a powerful tendency to subdue and mitigate sectarian bitterness. In order to give me some idea of the length to which the old Calvinistic doctrines were instilled into the infant mind, one of my companions presented me with a curious poem, called the 'Day of Doom,' formerly used as a school book in New England, and which elderly persons known to him had been required, some seventy years ago, to get by rote as children. This task must have occupied no small portion of their time, as this string of doggrel rhymes makes up no less than 224 stanzas of eight lines each. They were written by Michael Wigglesworth, A.M., teacher of the church of Malden, New England, and profess to give a poetical description of the Last Judgment. A great array of Scripture texts, from the Old and New Testament, is cited throughout in the margin as warranty for the orthodoxy of every dogma.

"Were such a composition now submitted to any committee of school

managers or teachers in New England, they would not only reject it, but the most orthodox amongst them would shrewdly suspect it to be a 'weak invention of the enemy,' designed to caricature, or give undue prominence to, precisely those tenets of the dominant Calvinism which the moderate party object to, as outraging human reason and as derogatory to the moral attributes of the Supreme Being. Such, however, were not the feelings of the celebrated Cotton Mather, in the year 1705, when he preached a funeral sermon on the author, which I find prefixed to my copy of the sixth edition, printed in 1715. On this occasion he not only eulogises Wigglesworth, but affirms that the poem itself contains 'plain truths drest up in a plain metre;' and further prophesies, that 'as the 'Day of Doom' had been often reprinted in both Englands, it will last till the Day itself shall arrive.' Some extracts from this document will aid the reader to estimate the wonderful revolution in popular opinion brought about in one or two generations, by which the harsher and sterner features of the old Calvinistic creed have been nearly eradicated. Its professors, indeed, may still contend as stoutly as ever for the old formularies of their hereditary faith, as they might fight for any other party banner; but their fanatical devotion to its dogmas, and their contempt for all other Christian churches, has happily softened down or disappeared.

"The poem opens with the arraignment of all 'the quick and dead,' who are summoned before the throne of God, and, having each pleaded at the bar, are answered by their Judge. Some of them declare that the Scriptures are 'so dark, that they have puzzled the wisest men;' others that, being 'heathens,' and having never had 'the written word preached to them,' they are entitled to pardon; in reply to which, the metaphysical subtleties of the doctrines of election and grace are fully propounded. The next class of offenders might awaken the sympathies of any heart not protected by a breastplate of theological dogmatism:—

"'Then to the bar all they drew near
Who died in infancy,
And never had, or good or bad,
Effected personally,' &c.

"These infants remonstrate against the hardship of having Adam's guilt laid to their charge:—

"'Not we, but he, ate of the tree
Whose fruit was interdicted:
Yet on us all, of his sad fall,
The punishment's inflicted.'

"The Judge replies, that none can suffer 'for what they never did:'—

(171.) "'But what you call old Adam's fall,
And only his trespass,
You call amiss to call it his,
Both his and yours it was.

(172.) "'He was designed, of all mankind,
To be a public head;
A common root, whence all should shoot,
And stood in all their stead.

"'He stood and fell, did ill or well
Not for himself alone,
But for you all, who now his fall
And trespass would disown.

(173.) "'If he had stood, then all his brood
Had been established,' &c.

(174.) "'Would you have grieved to have received
Through Adam so much good?' &c.

"'Since then to share in his welfare
You would have been content,
You may with reason, share in his treason,
And in his punishment.'

"A great body of Scripture texts are here introduced in confirmation; but the children are told, even including those 'who from the womb unto the tomb were straightway carried,' that they are to have 'the easiest room in hell;'—

(181.) "'The glorious King, thus answering,
They cease, and plead no longer,
Their consciences must needs confess
His reasons are the stronger.'

"The pains of hell, and the constant renovation of strength to enable the 'sinful wight' to bear an eternity of torment, are then dilated upon at such length, and so minutely, and a picture so harrowing to the soul is drawn, as to remind us of the excellent observations on this head of a modern New England divine. 'It is not wonderful,' he says, 'that this means of subjugating the mind should be freely used and dreadfully perverted, when we consider that no talent is required to inspire fear, and that coarse minds and hard hearts are signally gifted for this work of torture.' 'It is an instrument of tremendous power,' he adds, 'enabling a Protestant minister, whilst disclaiming papal pretensions, to build up a spiritual despotism, and to beget in those committed to his guidance a passive, servile state of mind, too agitated for deliberate and vigorous thought.'*

"That the pious minister of Malden, however, had no desire to usurp any undue influence over his panic-stricken readers, is very probable, and that he was only indulging in the usual strain of the preachers of his time, when he told of the 'yelling of the damned, as they were burnt eternally in the company of devils,' and went on to describe how—

"'God's vengeance feeds the flame
With piles of wood and brimstone flood,
That none can quench the same.'

"We next learn that the peace and calm blessedness of the saints elect, who are received into heaven, is not permitted to be disturbed by compassion for the damned; mothers and fathers feeling no pity for their lost children:—

"'The godly wife conceives no grief,
Nor can she shed a tear,
For the sad fate of her dear mate,
When she his doom doth hear.'

"The great distinction between the spirit of the times when these verses were written and the present age, appears to be this, that a paramount importance was then attached to those doctrinal points in which the leading sects differed from each other, whereas now Christianity is more generally considered to consist essentially in believing and obeying those scriptural precepts on which all churches agree."—[p. 50—55.]

* Channing's Works. London: vol. iii. p. 263.

ON THE TRINITY.

Believing the doctrine of the Trinity to be the great leading and all-pervading doctrine of Revelation, I am induced to make it the subject of one or two articles. I shall accordingly select, from among the numerous arguments in its support, those which appear to me most satisfactory ; and knowing, that, even among those who hold it, there are many either wholly unacquainted with them, or indisposed to admit them, I am the more desirous to give this information to the one, and to meet the objections of the other.

" It can be no just prejudice against the firmest belief of a trinity of distinct agents in the unity of the divine essence, subsisting and acting in and by one another, that we have nothing similar, within the compass of our observation, that we can image by it: for it is no more singular than those other facts, which we have no doubt about, viz. the immensity of the Divine Being, and creating power; and is instructed, precisely in the same manner, by facts which fall easily under our observation, and the record we have concerning them, when we find Three very expressly distinguished from one another, dignified with the same divine names, titles, attributes, and honours, and all the works, not excepting creation itself, by which the only true God has chosen to distinguish himself, and make himself known to men. Or shall we believe, that a perfectly wise and good being would lay such a snare for misleading his creatures, and drawing them into a crime he has expressed such an abhorrence of, the setting up other gods before him ?

"But the main prejudice which has had the greatest share in biassing numbers against the belief of this mystery will, I apprehend, be found to arise from the imperfection of our language, and the terms in which it is expressed there. The word *God*, in our language, has no determinate signification ; but, like the proper names of men, is made use of to denote that Being whom we profess to worship. *Person* again, in vulgar and even in philosophical language, denotes an individual agent. This makes it very hard to avoid apprehending three persons as three gods. The Hebrews had greatly the advantage of us in this respect. They had a name, Jehovah, which denominated the divine essence, and is always singular, and the Jehovah is always declared to be one. But they had another name, which denoted the relation which he condescended to stand in to his creatures of mankind, and expresseth the obligation he had taken upon himself to make good the promises which he had made them, and which we know were to be fulfilled by the Word and Spirit, as well as by the Father : and this has constantly a plural termination, Elahim ; not for want of a singular term, which the author of it could never have been at a loss for, and which it is not conceivable he would have chosen in his addresses to a people so prone to fall into idolatry and polytheism as the old Israelites were, had it not been to express an important truth, that, though *Jehovah*, the *Essence*, is one, yet the *Elahim* are more than one.

"But neither will it be found strictly true, that there is nothing in nature any way resembling this mystery ; though it should be enough to make it credible, that there is nothing found there that can warrant us to conclude it impossible. This material system, and the material powers and under-agents by which

the order, the wise Creator has appointed, is supported and maintained, we have great reason to believe was designed for a representation of the spiritual unseen world, and of that (to us inconceivable) order, by which all things are carried on there; upon this general principle, that what is seen is to the material, the same God is to the spiritual world. And upon this the whole of the descriptive language we have of spiritual and unseen things is, in a great measure, formed. What Moses calls by a name which we render *expansion*, or *firmament*, and which from him we learn is the matter of the material heavens, most perfect wisdom has formed into a most stupendous machine, by which all things throughout the system are managed and carried on in their proper order. We see it, and very sensibly feel it is so, in this earth of ours. We cannot subsist a moment without air to breathe in; and were the compression it makes taken off, we know, by easy experiments, how the earth itself must be dissipated, and every thing dissolved into that state of confusion in which the whole matter of the universe was originally created, when the earth was without form, and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep. Were it even possible that air could subsist without light, we certainly know it could answer none of those purposes, nor produce those vicissitudes and changes, which we find so necessary for adorning the earth as it is every season, and for making it useful to its inhabitants. We know as well, that there can be no light but what issues from and is sent forth by the force of fire, and that that cannot be supported but by a flux of air continually streaming into it; and which is so lost there, that no account can be made of it; but that it is refined there, and thrown out again in the form of light; which again, by degrees, coalesces into such grumes as constitute air. Thus this wonder-machine supports itself and every thing else. The sun, or fire at its orb, is the great regulator, but operates only by the light it sends forth, and is supported and maintained by the air which is formed out of it. The matter is the same; but their form and distinct offices sensibly distinguish them; and thus subsist and set in perfect union, in and by one another.

"When we compare this, and the effects produced by this wonderful combination, with the accounts we have made, in the language formed upon it, of the nature and operations of the Great Creator, it will not be easy for any one to avoid concluding, that, in these material under-agents, he designed to give us a sensible image of himself, and the way in which he exerts his almighty power. Our God dwells in light inaccessible, which no man can approach unto: and we are told expressly, that he is a consuming fire. His eternal Word, manifested in the person of Jesus Christ, is almost every where styled *The Light of the world*; and by him it is that every thing is done which the Father does. The original languages have but one name for the material air and that eternal Spirit, by whom the Father and the Word perform and finish all their operations on the creature.

"There can hardly be a greater and more dangerous imposition upon ourselves and others than the attempting to reduce these analogical descriptions of spiritual and unseen things, by which only we can come at any conceptions of them at all, to so many metaphors, such as the masters of human eloquence use for embellishing their discourses. So far from it, that they are not only different in kind, but very nearly opposite to and inconsistent with one another

If both the terms of a metaphor are not perfectly known, the brilliancy and force of it are certainly lost. Here it is just the reverse. What is meant to be discovered in this way is altogether unknown; neither can it be known in any other way than by the image which represents it, and by which we may be helped to form such conceptions as the imperfections of our constitutions can admit of; and we have proper directions given us to avoid the abuse of such images, and forming unworthy notions of what they were employed to represent."—*Riccaltoun's Works*, vol. ii. p. 29—35.

"That the three principles of motion, which govern the natural world, are *Fire, Light,* and *Air,* is so evident in general, that we need little to prove what the senses will confirm to all mankind.

"But perhaps it may not be so evident, that these three agents support the life of man, whom the wise have long considered as a lesser world; yet every person, who applies his mind to consider the case, will soon see it to be true.

"In the body of man there is a threefold life to be supported: first, in the heart and blood-vessels; secondly, in the organs of respiration; and lastly, in the nerves—the instruments of sensation. Each of these, taken separately, forms a sort of tree, and has the appearance of it, when represented in the tables of anatomists. There is one large tree (if not rather two) of the arteries and veins; another of the nerves, equally extended with the former; and a third formed by the trachea, or wind-pipe, with its branches in the lobes of the lungs.

"On these capacities or departments of the animal economy, the three moving principles of nature are constantly acting for the support of life. The heat of fire preserves the fluidity of the blood in the veins and arteries, and is necessary to the circulation of it. The nerves—the channels of sensation—are acted upon by the light; and, for this purpose, are found to be pellucid lengthwise; which is most manifest in the optic nerve. The organs of respiration are acted upon by the air, which gives us breath; and without which the system of life cannot long subsist.

"Thus it appears, that life is preserved in the three several departments of the animal economy by the three elementary principles which govern the world. The heart is the proper residence of fire: not of *burning* but of *vivifying* fire. The head is the seat of light, which acts most sensibly in the organs of sight; but is diffused from the brain to all parts of the body. In the lungs is the proper residence of air; the inspiration and respiration of which assist in the circulation of the blood: and, if the heart be considered as a cistern or reservoir, the lungs may be considered as a pump continually working upon it.

"The three powers of nature are nowhere more conspicuous and wonderful than in their operations within the body of man: and what is still further for our purpose, they act together in unity; all conspiring to the same end, and keeping up one and the same life.

"Neither of these can produce their effect without the other two. What can air do in the lungs, when the blood is no longer in the heart? And what can these two avail, unless there be sensation in the nerves: that is, unless light gives sensation to the body, as information gives light to the mind?

"As truth grows out of truth, much might be said on the three powers of man in the three seats of life: of his affections in the *heart,* his understanding

in the *head*, and his speech in the *lungs*; which three faculties constitute the man, considered as an intellectual being: and these act in unity in all that is rightly done by him. When his *understanding* speaks without his *affections*, his *head* without his *heart*, he is a deceiver, a false friend, and a dangerous enemy. When his *affection* speaks without his *understanding*, the *heart* without the *head*, man becomes an enthusiast or a fool. But when *speech*, and the *understanding*, and the *affections*, all go together, as they should do, then is man that being which God intended him to be; and to assist him herein, the Divine *Spirit* gives him the grace of speech; while the Divine Word is a *light* to his understanding, and a *fire* to his affections."—*The Trinitarian Analogy. Jones's Works*, vol. i. p. 312—315.

"There is avowedly something perfectly incomprehensible in the attributes of Deity, when contemplated in relation to *time*; there is also something utterly incomprehensible when we contemplate them in reference to *space*; there may then be something incomprehensible when we refer them to other metaphysical modes. Why, for example, may they not be as incomprehensible when contemplated in reference to *number*? And why should any matter of revelation be rejected on this latter ground, when mysteriousness on the two former does not lead to any such rejection?"—*Letter to a Friend on the Evidences of the Christian Revelation.* By Olinthus Gregory, LL.D., &c. vol. i. p. 64.

Gen. xviii. "The three persons of the Trinity, in the shape of three men, appear to Abraham, and dine with him; and eat the first flesh that is mentioned eaten in all the Scripture."—*Lightfoot*, vol. ii. p. 342. Pitman's Edit.

This view is rejected by Mr. Faber for the following reasons. "The Word of God has repeatedly become visible in human form; and the Divine Spirit has displayed himself, both in the figure of a dove, and under the semblance of cloven fiery tongues, so that there could be no obstacle to our believing that he also might have been one of the three men who conversed with Abraham: but we are expressly taught, that *no man hath seen God*, the Father, *at any time*, and he is therefore specially celebrated as the *invisible* Deity. Hence we are evidently precluded from supposing the third man to be an appearance of the Paternal Godhead. Such being the case, we are compelled to discard the theory, which would make Abraham converse with a visible manifestation of the whole Trinity."—*Horæ Mosaicæ*, vol. ii. p. 83, 84.

This argument will not stand: for 1st. In the quotation from 1 John iv. 12, the words "the Father" are interpolated. 2nd. The conversation in Exodus xxiii. 12—23, is, on his own showing, with God the Son, who says, in ver. 20, "no man can see me and live." I therefore infer that *invisibility* is predicated of the Divine Essence only, and that seeing a manifestation of any one or all of the Divine Persons is not seeing God. 3rd. We know the Father has manifested himself by a voice, (Matt. iii. 17; John xii. 27, 28,) and it does not appear why a manifestation to one bodily organ should be more unsuitable than to another. 4th. The objection infringes on the essential co-equality of all the Divine Persons.

I reserve the consideration of the cherubim, or second, emblem of the Trinity, for another opportunity. R. R.

IS FAITH, OR BELIEVING, ESSENTIAL TO SALVATION?

Where do the Scriptures either expressly or by implication say that faith or believing is essential to salvation? The Scriptures in this being silent, who then dares proclaim that in any sense it is?

Faith, in many passages of the word of God, signifies the thing believed, even the word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. The just man Jesus Christ lived by this faith. Hab. i. 4; Matt. iv. 4. Again, faith signifies the *belief* of the truth: a full persuasion that whatsoever God has promised he is able and faithful to perform.

Such was the *strong* faith of Abraham. Rom. iv. 20, 21. The *great* faith of the centurion was a full persuasion that Jesus was able, and would infallibly bring to pass, every word that he said. Luke vii. 9. The faith of Sarah was, that she judged him faithful who had promised. Heb. xi. 11. Was the *believing* of Abraham,—of the centurion,—of Sarah,—*essential* to the *performance* of the things promised? Clearly not. It was not said to the centurion, *If* thou believest, or continuest to believe, but "*As* thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee." It is recorded that multitudes followed Jesus, and he *healed* them *all*. Matt. xii. 15. And Jesus went forth, and saw a great multitude, and healed their sick. Matt. xiv. 14. And healed them that had need of healing. Luke xi. 11. From these passages it plainly appears that Jesus healed *all* who came to him needing healing, even great multitudes. Some have maintained, that our blessed Lord healed those only who had *faith* to be healed. "Thy faith hath saved thee"—so it is written: therefore they think that without faith none would or could have been healed or saved. But it is certain that only a very small number of those whom the Lord healed *believed* at all. Only *one* of the *ten* lepers turned back to give glory to God. And the impotent man who was healed did not so much as *know who* it was that healed him; so he must have been destitute of faith in the Son of God altogether. Faith therefore could not be essential to the receiving of these healing blessings. Although the centurion, like Peter on the sea, had lost his faith before he got home, he would have found his servant healed.

The promise to Abraham was, "He that shall come forth out of thine own loins shall be thine heir; and innumerable as are the stars, *so* shall thy seed be." Gen. xv. 4, 5. And again—"In thy seed shall *all* nations and families of the earth be blessed." Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18, xxvi. 4, xxviii. 14, &c. Paul (Gal. iii. 8) calls this the *gospel* preached before of God to Abraham. This was the *promise* of a blessing, confirmed by the *oath* of Jehovah, wholly and in every sense of the words *unconditional*. It is not *if* Abraham believe, the thing promised shall come to pass; but independent of Abraham's or Sarah's believing, it is unconditionally declared by him who cannot lie, that Isaac shall be born, and in his seed shall all families of the earth be blessed. This must have infallibly come to pass, though Sarah and Abraham had continued laughing in doubt and unbelief. It was impossible that their unbelief could make the faithfulness of God of none effect. 2 Tim. ii. 3; Rom. iii. 3, 4.

The word of salvation—the gospel of the grace of God, *is* a *truth* before ever the sound of it comes to our ears; our unbelief cannot make it a *lie*. It is the everlasting gospel, and will remain *true* eternally, independent of the belief or unbelief of any creature. Jacob did not believe that his beloved son Joseph was *alive;* still, however, it was *true*. Jacob's faith was not essential to Joseph's being alive.

Abraham's faith gave glory to *God;* but were it true as the Morrisonians and others assert, that the mere human being has *power* to *believe* the gospel, and that *his belief* is *essential* to *salvation*, then the glory by Abraham's strong faith would have been given to *man*—they maintaining that at least, without the co-operation of man, through the exertion of his believing power, God could not have performed what he promised!! The real fact seems to be, that

there is nothing whatever on the part of man *essential* to salvation. Salvation appertaineth to God *alone*. Eternal life is the gift of God, not obtainable by the exertions of man—whether exertions of body or mind—inerent or imparted.

Wherefore then serveth the gospel? Much every way. There is eternal life to *every* man, in the Son of God, as certainly as there was death to every man, in Adam; but no one could have known this except the word of this salvation had been *sent* to him. The gospel is sent to give *knowledge* of salvation by the remission of sins. Luke i. 77. To give the light of the *knowledge* of the glory of God. 2 Cor. iv. 6. To make *known* the mystery of the gospel. Eph. vi. 18. To the intent that now, to the principalities and powers in the heavenlies, might be made *known* by the church the manifold wisdom of God. Eph. iii. 10. That the earth may be filled with the *knowledge* of the Lord as the waters cover the sea. Hab. ii. 14. These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God, that ye may *know* that ye have eternal life; and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God. 1 John v. 13. Not one hint is here given of the *sending* of the word, neither of the *believing* of the word, being *essential* to *salvation*.

It is an infallible truth, and for ever will remain a truth, that all are reconciled to God by the *death*, and all saved by the life, of his Son Jesus Christ. Rom. v. 10. But, unless these glad tidings had been sent to us, we could never have known the gracious truth; and except the tidings are *believed*, we cannot be *profited*. The hearing ear, the seeing eye, the understanding and believing heart, are *given* by God; and, in receiving these gifts,iwe are passive as clay in the hands of the potter. These may be said to be *essential* to the *knowledge* of salvation; but not to *salvation*. We may hear the sound of the word of salvation, and not understand it to be true and divine; but it is impossible that we can understand it to be true and divine, one moment, without believing it. *Exerting acts* of faith—trying to believe, is out-and-out humbug. By *believing*, we *understand*: by *understanding* we *believe*. Both the understanding of the word to be true, and the believing of it, come from God, as really as the opening of the eyes of a man born blind. Be it here understood, that *believing* is admitted to be essential to the *knowledge* of salvation, not as being the exertion of *man*, but *only* as being the work of *God*.

There are myriads of the human family, dead and alive, to whom even the *sound* of the word of salvation never came. Myriads die in infancy; and there are, here and there, many who are insane. With all these the belief of the gospel is impossible; yet none of these are excluded from the common salvation, or from the creatures in heaven, earth, under the earth, and in the sea, who shall be blessed in Jesus Christ, and call him blessed. Rev. iv. 13.

How then is it possible that faith can be essential to salvation?

ANETAZΩ.

ETERNAL TORMENTS AND THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN.

He who asserts, that man may undergo eternal torments, and yet finda himself constrained to admit, that it is a being possessed of everlasting existence, and of physical attributes and properties essentially different from those of man, who is eternally tormented; as, on the one hand, he contradicts and thereby refutes himself, by maintaining, in the same breath, that it is *a man* and that it is *not a man* who is thus tormented, so, on the other, he becomes indirectly an unwilling witness to the truth of the grand position laid down by me, namely, that the subjection of *man* constituted as he is, to eternal torments, is an arrant impossibility.—*Thom's Dialogues*.

EXTRACT FROM SOUTHEY'S LIFE OF WESLEY, WITH NOTES BY COLERIDGE.

Southey in comment on Whitfield's Question to Wesley, "*What is there in reprobation so horrid?*" makes the following indignant answer:—

"That question might easily have been answered. The doctrine implies that an Almighty and All-wise Creator has called into existence the greater part of the human race to the end, that after a short, sinful, and miserable life, they should pass into an eternity of inconceivable torments, it being the pleasure of their Creator, that they should not be able to obey his commands, and yet incur the penalty of everlasting damnation for disobedience. In the words of Mr. Wesley, who has stated the case with equal force and truth: 'The sum of all is this; one in twenty (suppose) of mankind, are *elected*; nineteen in twenty are reprobated. The elect shall be saved, *do what they will*, the *reprobate* shall be damned, *do what they can!* This is the doctrine of Calvinism, for which *diabolism* would be a better name; and, in the worst and bloodiest idolatry that ever defiled the earth, there is nothing so horrid, so monstrous, so impious as this.'"

Coleridge adds: "O dear and honoured Southey! all this is very plausible, the picture frightful, and a first *recoil* inevitable by any sane mind. But what have you to substitute—or rather what had *Wesley* who still believed in eternal (for so he understood the word everlasting) torments? Boldly do I answer, and appeal to Taylor's Letters on Original Sin, for the proof,—a mere paltry evasion!—a *quibble* (and one that is quite absurd when applied to an omniscience and omnipotence perpetually *creative*) between decreeing and permitting. If *any*, it should be a Spanish theologian to treat of this subject—for the Spaniards only combine depth with subtilty. I feel, and think as you do, Southey! How should it be otherwise Southey? In this only I differ, that the controversy is between Whitfield and Wesley, or men like *them*. And it is not fair to take the question abstractedly from the *total* creed of the parties. *Not* simply, what is there in reprobation so horrible? To this you have returned the fit answer. *But*, what is there in it that Mr. Wesley could, with consistency, affect horror at? Let him turn the broad road round before it comes to the *everlasting* fire-lake; and then he may reprobate reprobation as loudly as he lists. Till then *favete linguæ*.—S. T. C."

---

1 Tim. iii. 16.—"seen by angels"—the prophets and apostles. . . By these, says the apostle, God in Christ was seen, . . . and by them, his witnesses, he was preached unto the Gentiles. . . . And, lest they might be disposed to envy the lot of his chosen messengers, who had seen him with their eyes, . . . his own especial word has been recorded for their—I had better say—our comfort; for their case is ours. "Blessed are they who have not seen, and yet have believed."—*Arnold's Sermons*, Vol. II. p. 110, 111.

MISCELLANEA.

Important Questions to Believers in Endless Misery.

1. If the Saviour tasted death for *every man*, and gave himself a ransom for *all*, how can he see of the travail of his soul, and be *satisfied*, if ALL are not saved?

2. If all the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion, with songs and everlasting joy, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away, can ANY be left to *mourn* and lament to all eternity?

3. How can Christ be the head of *every man*, the saviour of *all men*, and the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the *world*, if ANY man is lost?

4. If Christ be the propitiation for the sins of the *whole world*, how can any possibly be endlessly miserable in consequence of sin, when the Father has accepted the atonement made by the Son, and has declared himself well pleased for his righteousness sake?

5. If God was in Christ reconciling the *world* (or all men) unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, how can he punish them eternally for what he does not impute to them?

6. If grace has abounded more than sin, how can any of Adam's race be irrecoverably lost?

7. Can the purpose for which God sent his Son into the world possibly fail? If not, then the world will be saved. "For we have seen and do testify that the Father hath sent his Son to be the *Saviour of the world*." It takes each, all, and everyone to make a world.

8. When God says that he is merciful, and *will not* cast off for ever, that he will not contend for ever, because he delighteth in mercy, and gives other sufficient reasons why he will not—that the souls would fail before him, &c.—does it mean that he *will*, or *will not* do these things? If it mean that he *will not*—and it most certainly reads so—why do people who profess to believe God when he speaks, say that he *will do* what he says he *will not do*? Would it not be better for them, and for the cause of Christianity, to believe God, as Abraham did, that their faith might be accounted to them for righteousness? "Let God be true."

Eternal torments pay no debt. Eternal torments cancel no offence. Eternal torments have no satisfaction to divine justice. Eternal torments are inconsistent with divine purity; because such a state, instead of extinguishing, accumulates offence. Eternal torments are an absolute denial of Christ's dying for our offences, and rising again for our justification.—*Relly.*

An Extinguisher.--A gentleman once said to a Universalist, "Sir, I have read every word in the Scriptures many times; and it is very strange if the doctrine of the Universalism which you hold, is there, that I have not found it." "I am not surprised at this," said the Universalist, "I once went to light my candle with the extinguisher on it; now prejudice, from education, learning, &c., often forms an extinguisher. It is not enough to bring the candle, you must remove the extinguisher."

The above from "The Covenant" reminds us of a Presbyterian lady of our acquaintance, who on being asked the question "what she thought the word 'pit' in the Scriptures means," replied, "it means, no doubt, in all cases, the place of torment for the finally impenitent. The questioner then inquired whether Joseph's brethren cast himinto as deep a pit as the one she referred to; when she closed all further debate by saying she did not approve of *trifling* with the Bible. Recently a lady and her daughter in one of our country towns prepared themselves to attend a Temperance Lecture to be given in the place, by one of our distinguished preachers. Just before they were ready to start, and probably in the anticipation of a rich, intellectual entertainment for the evening, it was announced that the speaker was a Universalist clergyman! What an "extinguisher" was this! the lady and her daughter stayed at home. They could not conscientiously, we presume, hear the truth even, from such a source; they would not even attempt to light the "candle with the extinguisher on." *Candour* listens with prudence and judges with caution. *Prejudice* judges blindly and condemns unheard; when will the former gain the ascendency?—*Star in the West.*

REVIEWS.

Divine Inversion; *or a View of the Character of God as in all respects opposed to the Character of Man.* By David Thom, D. D., Ph. D. London, H. K. Lewis.

Having promised in a former article to introduce the readers of this magazine to some better acquaintance with Dr. Thom of Liverpool and his theology, we propose now at a convenient season to redeem that pledge, and return to the examination of his writings. They are both numerous and extensive, but the treatise to which we formerly referred, and which is specified at the head of this article, being the foundation of, and key to all the rest, we shall confine ourselves to that for the present. Dr. Thom is the most consistent, as well as original of all heretics that we know. He has delivered a system of his own on the field of popular theology as round as a cricket ball, albeit of heavier metal; and *Divine Inversion* is the heart of it. It is right enough, perhaps, to be scandalized at portions of the Dr.'s creed, until this is understood, and to say even that it is incomprehensible; but when his notions are found ultimately to conform and cohere among themselves, and the principle of their coherence to be a *fact* more or less distinctly developed, it behoves us to receive with respectful toleration at least, if we cannot absolutely coincide with, the system he propounds. Such a system Dr. Thom's unquestionably is, the fact upon which it is built, and in which it coheres, being the principle now in question.

The doctrine so to speak, or fact of Divine Inversion was first suggested, it appears, to the Dr.'s mind, by a passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews, xi. 3, —where *faith* is described as the ground or medium of all spiritual *understanding*, whereas understanding, in the ordinary course of our experience as intelligent beings, is the ground of all natural faith; the process, as the Dr. affirms, although we do not quite agree with him in this particular, being thus reversed. The book itself, in which the fact thus suggested is illustrated and confirmed, begins with a chapter of Hints, where the doctrine is traced as it were indirectly through various passages of Scripture—Luke xvi. 15, James iv. 6, &c. The doctrine is then affirmed as having been stated by Christ himself explicitly, in Matt. xxii. 41—46. From which it is gathered, in so many terms, very clearly, that *naturally* David is first, and Messiah second; but *spiritually*, Messiah first, and David second; the order of their relationship being thus *inverted*. Several quotations, follow this, from Scripture, in which the same process of God's inverting the natural, or what seems to be the natural order of human affairs, appears to be confirmed,—as in the case of primogeniture for example, which has been frequently set aside by God; and more explicitly still in that parable of the Labourers, in which the first and the last in human account occupy the very opposite extremes in the divine. An objection taken from the *resemblance* of types and shadows to their substances or antitypes, from which it might be inferred that the doctrine did not hold good in such cases, is then ingeniously removed; and the whole pith of the principle brought out in a formula—slight *resemblance*, actual *difference*, positive and necessary *opposition*, between things human and divine. According to this view of the matter, that creation of man which is said to have been in the image of God implied only a superficial or shadowy resemblance, there being in reality an essential difference and necessary opposition between the creature and the Creator; and that order of events which we observe in human life and history, called providential, presents not only the faintest imaginable type of the grand government of God, but is absolutely and diametrically the reverse of his divine *spiritual* administration. As is the creature, finite and shadowy, such also is the destiny he now fulfils; as is the Creator, infinite and substantial, such also is the administration he pursues. And these are opposed, the

one to the other; as darkness in the one, and light in the other; as falsehood in the one, and truth in the other; as corruption in the one, and purity in the the other; as weakness in the one, and strength in the other; as death in the one, and life in the other; as mortality in the one, and immortality in the other; as transition in the one, and eternal stability in the other: and this in all the multiform combinations of life, and possible vicissitudes of being;—Jehovah adapting himself in gracious opposition, as it were, to the attitudes and motions of froward and rebellious humanity; in mercy circumventing, superseding, and finally absorbing it. On this principle, we find God, contrary to all human expectation, precedent, and experience, redeeming, enlightening, regenerating, vouchsafing resurrection, and conferring immortality; in a word, working out salvation and manifesting love, by means and in a form to us utterly incomprehensible; so that to reason on the supposed agreement and correspondence, as men generally do, of things human and divine, must and does lead to serious and extensive errors. See the failure of Butler's Analogy, for example, as an attempted exposition of God's moral and spiritual economy of the world. In all this there is much acute reasoning and profound thinking; yet there are some points where the case seems hardly to be fully stated: the most remarkable fact in the whole history of human affairs, the supremacy of Japheth, being an example of primogeniture confirmed, with a very subordinate inversion of its rights; and the failure of Butler's Analogy being accounted for quite as much by his limited experience of the divine *power* of Christianity, as by his ignorance of divine *inversion*.

The volume, after this, is devoted almost exclusively to illustration; and several topics of great interest both to the Christian, to the philosopher, and to the general reader, are investigated, and with no small success by an application of the doctrine in question. The most important of these, perhaps, is that of "Reason and Revelation" opposed, as shadow and substance; on which our author observes very beautifully, that "the renitency, resistance, or struggle of the shadow is unavailing. . . . . The continued existence of the shadow, such as it is, lies all along at the mercy of the gnomon; or rather of light, by which through the medium of the gnomon the shadow is projected. And when light has attained to its zenith, the conflict is terminated; for shadow then identified with its substance, expires." Thus, he goes on to argue, "Over the mind of God as substance, reason as shadow has no power whatever. But the mind of God as revealed being the substance of reason, and that by which reason is temporarily projected, has, whenever and wherever exerted, power over it." Our readers from this may catch a glimpse, perhaps, of the true character and style of the work. But besides this, there are other illustrations also, of great force and propriety effectively and elaborately handled. For a little overstraining here and there to bring the doctrine more fully out, the reader may perhaps be prepared; yet there is much truth, and great ingenuity in them all. Of those which seem to be overwrought, that distinction between *reconciliation* and *salvation* in the history of the Church may be quoted as an example; which appears to ourselves at least to be a piece of altogether unnecessary exegetical refinement. There is, indeed, a distinction between reconciliation and salvation scriptural and authentic enough; but not the sort of distinction, we humbly conceive, which the learned author so ingeniously attempts to illustrate. The distinction we refer to is in the history of the individual, a reality—not in the history of the Church, an abstraction. Such too, we are afraid, in some respects, is that elaborate disquisition on the temporal origin and temporary existence of evil: in which, moreover, the reverend author seems to invalidate his own principles. The eternal existence of sin and misery in creatures like ourselves, he says in effect, is absolutely inconsistent with the judgment "even of the unsophisticated mind," and "the most egregious violation of all the rules of righteousness," &c.; therefore, it cannot be! But according to the tenor of the whole argument, that is the very reason why it should be; because our judgments on such subjects are all diametrically opposed to God's actual

procedure: God does exactly what we suppose he will not do; and *vice versa*. But in this case, says the Dr., unsophisticated human judgment and all the rules of righteousness are in absolute coincidence with, and as it were in harmonious anticipation of true Scripture teaching. They may, or they may not; we pronounce no opinion: but if they are, what becomes of Divine inversion as an *universal* and *infallible* principle? The truth is, Divine inversion, as a theory of God's government, is good only *pro tanto*; only as far as it will go, and no farther: and the chief, indeed the only objection we have to urge against the Dr.'s treatise on the subject is, that he seems disposed to push it to extremes; to systematise prematurely, on inadequate grounds. The induction, as Lord Bacon would have said, is not wide enough. Should opposition *of necessity* exist between all creatures and the Creator? Does it exist? Between sinful creatures and an infinitely pure and holy Creator, there is, and necessarily must be direct and irreconcilable opposition; and the administration of such a God towards such creatures will necessarily also take the form of *inversion* in most things, for everything that is wrong must be inverted to be made right. But would inversion have been the order of the universe, even of our universe, if there had been no sin? Certainly not. There would have been resemblance rather, and with difference undoubtedly; but with harmony, with everlasting concord, and not with *opposition*. The principle of inversion, therefore, as it now *seems* to exist, is but a temporary element in providence; not a fundamental law in nature. When things which are now wrong, but were not always so, have been again righted, there will be no more inversion, either real or seeming. The doctrine, in short, is but another form, and philosophical exposition of the old, orthodox, Westminster idea of *original sin*. So taken, and legitimately applied, in relation to that ultimate, and as we believe inexplicable, fact in the history of our moral constitution, the theory is admirable; beyond that, with our present light at least, and the authority of Scripture on the subject, we seek in vain with any degree of consistency to extend it.

On this fact of Divine inversion, however, as understood by himself, the whole system of Dr. Thom's theology, as we have already hinted, is built, and coheres with a singular uniformity. His *universalism*, as connected fundamentally with this doctrine, differs we believe from most other theories on that subject. As we do not individually subscribe to this idea, seeing no sufficient scriptural grounds in the meantime for adopting it, we may speak more freely, and do not hesitate to say, that in the Dr's hands it assumes an aspect of philosophic, even of sublime originality very seldom presented. "At last," says he, in reference to the continued opposition of the two natures, human and Divine, "at last matters attain to a crisis. And only one such can be conceived of. Creature opposition must give way to, must be overwhelmed and destroyed by, Divine opposition. In the nature of the Creator, the nature of the rebellious creature must be swallowed up; and so it is. Corruption is swallowed up in incorruption; mortality is swallowed up of life." Such absorption then, through Christ, as God our righteousness, according to this amiable and most spiritually minded theorist, is the destiny of our guilty race. Possibly.

A MODERN NONCONFORMIST.

The Treatise of Albertus Magnus [1193—1280.] *De adherendo Deo: of adhering to God.* Translated from the Latin. London: C. Gilpin.

This little book was sent to us with the expectation of our "taking some editorial notice of it." The piety of the writer undoubtedly shines by its contrast with the proverbial darkness of the middle ages. It is however a piety of that visionary cast, which has often since appeared, not only in individuals, but in whole communities; of which the Port Royalists in France, and the

Society of Friends, among ourselves, have flourished most in history. Though it is therefore unnecessary to speak of their many virtues, of the persecutions which they suffered, or of the eminent men which they produced, it will be always well to caution warm and imaginative minds against the unsoundness of their leading principle. "There is," as Lightfoot justly observes, "no promise in Scripture, whereupon the spirit of revelation is to be expected after the fall of Jerusalem. It is," says he, "a delusion, by which men deceive themselves and others, when they think and assert that what promises are made of revelation, or of great light, are to be applied to these times."—Vol. VI. p. 240, Pitman's Edit. In fact, much positive evil results from it. Such assumptions are known to invest the grossest errors with all the authority of inspiration, and even to supersede that of the sacred writings. This is avowed by Barclay in his second and third Propositions, and we find the following sentence in the little book before us. "Wherefore, if thou makest it thy business to strip and purify thyself from all images and representations, and with trust and confidence to simplify and quiet thy heart and mind in the Lord thy God, that thou mayest feel and take in the fountain of the Divine good pleasure in all thy inward parts, and by thy good will be united to God in thy intellect or understanding, this exercise alone will be sufficient for thee, and serve instead of all study, and reading the holy Scriptures; and will advance thee to the love of God and thy neighbour, according as the anointing teacheth thee." p. 13. How opposite this to 1 Tim. iv. 13, and 2 Tim. iii. 16.

"*All Prophecy Fulfilled*; *as shown by our Lord, in his Discourse to his Disciples, recorded in Matthew* xxiv, xxv; *Mark* xiii; *Luke* xxi." Paisley: John Neilson. 1850.

All prophecy has undoubtedly been fulfilled; but we cannot concur with this writer (who signs A. H. in the last page,) in placing that fulfilment quite so early as the destruction of Jerusalem. As A. H. takes no notice of Dr. Lee's writings, we conclude he has not seen them; and therefore recommend his recent work, entitled "An Inquiry into the Nature, Progress, and End of Prophecy," &c. to A. H.'s attentive consideration. We also refer him to the first article in our present number, as drawing, from a very few texts, decisive proof, that the fulfilment of all prophecy extended to the time of Constantine. With this exception, we see much to admire in A. H.'s tract; and deny, with him, the existence of all authorised ministry after the cessation of the gifts essential to its exercise, "so that all, from the Hierarchy of Rome, down through all names and denominations, to the meanest oracle of the most petty conventicle, that electrifies his followers with his wisdom, or enslaves their minds with the authority of his *ism* or his *doxy*,—all are alike without authority, and hence usurp the right of Him who is the only *Potentate*, the King of kings, and Lord of lords. 1 Tim. vi. 15." p. 15.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

Sir,—The following passage, extracted from Mr. Granville Penn's "Annotations to the Book of the New Covenant," appears to me so important, as settling in a brief but satisfactory manner one of our most puzzling philological controversies, that, as I suspect it is not generally known, I make no apology for soliciting for it a place in the pages of your Magazine.

Comparing 1 Tim. iii. 15, 16, with iv. 10, we are struck to observe the same phrase, θεος ζων, (in oblique cases,) employed in both; and in the event of Cramer's suggestion mentioned by Woide, and acquiesced in by Penn, being correct, we have *the*

living God ascertained to be the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Lord Jesus Christ ascertained to be *the Saviour of all men*,—the two passages in these, as well as in other respects, shedding light upon each other.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
D. THOM.

3, *St. Mary's Place, Edge Hill, Liverpool, June* 12, 1850.

" [1 Tim. chap. iii. ver. 15, 16, 17.] The paragraph, comprising these three verses, has caused such intricate controversies among the Commentators, that, in order to attain to a solution of their difficulties, satisfactory to the understanding, it is indispensably necessary to cast from the mind all that has hitherto been written on the subject, and to investigate their import *de novo*. These three verses of this revision form only two in the printed texts; the last of which, in the oldest version (the Latin,) begins with the relative 'quod,' made to agree with its falsely translated antecedent 'sacramentum' for μυστηριον. The *Clerment* Latinizing Gr. M.S., or D. 2 of Wetstein, has ὁ as the relative of μυστηριον. The *Vat.* M.S. can afford us no assistance, as it is defective of the Epistles to Timothy. St. Cyrill of Alex. reads ὁς, as does the Coptic version: and after all that has been disputed respecting the readings of the *Ephrem* and Alex. MSS., I think it must be admitted, by any mind perfectly free and unbiassed, that they both read ΟΣ, as Cyrill, and not ΘΣ. To the Venetian MSS. 33, 34, collated by Birch, is annexed this scholion, ὁ εν ἁγιοις Κυριλλος, εν τῳ δωδεκα τῳ κεφαλαιῳ των σχολιων φησι ὁς ἐφανερωθη." (St. Cyrill is quoted as an authority for the use of ὁς, *who—who was manifest*.) " All the earliest testimonies, therefore, commence the 17th verse of this revision," (the 16th of the common version,) " with a *relative pronoun;* the Greek, with the masculine relative, ὁς; the Latin, and the Latinizing Greek, with the neuter, 'quod,' and ὁ; the former of which readings, (ὁς,) is alone entitled to consideration.

" Now the result is the same whether the reading be 'ΟΣ or ΘΣ," (*who* or *God*) " if the context be duly divided and punctuated. Bengel was the first to point out, that στυλος," (pillar,) " does not look back to εκκλησια," (church,)' " but forward to μυστηριον," (mystery,) " and begins a separate clause;* which clause is, in fact, an *interruptive exclamation in parenthesis*, with which the apostle introduces his sublime conclusion. 'Nec me fugit,' says Woide, 'viros doctissimos lectionem OC alteri ΘC praeferre.—Enimentissimus, summeque venerandus theologus, Magnificus Universitatis Kiloniensis Pro—Cancelarius, Joannes Andreas Cramer, omnibus eruditis in Germania notus et carus, in suis ad me literis ΟΣ legit, quibusdam vocibus hoc modo parenthesi inclusis: ἥτις ἐστιν ἐκκλησια ΘΕΟΥ ΖΩΝΤΟΣ, (στυλος και ἑδραιωμα της ἀληθειας, και ὁμολογουμενως μεγα ἐστι το της ευσεβειας" (misprinted ἀσεβειας) " μυστηριον,) ὁς ἐφανερωθη, &c., ita ut de sensu hujus loci nulla sit dissensio, sed utraque lectio amice conspiret.'—(Praef. ad Cod. MS. Alex. pp. 31, 32." (Woide who published the *Fac simile* of the Alexandrian MS, above sixty years ago, here mentions the fact of J. A. Cramer, one of the most eminent theologians then in Germany, having in a letter to him suggested ὁς, *who*, as the true reading, and, throwing the intermediate words into a parenthesis, having connected *the living God* with *who*, thus: *which is the Church of* THE LIVING GOD, *(the pillar and ground of the the truth, and without controversy great is the mystery of godliness*, or piety,) *who was manifest in flesh*, &c.) " The continnous sense is, Θεου ζωντος,—ὁς ἐφανερωθη—'*the living God—who* was manifested in the flesh.' From indiscernment of this direct relation between Θεου ζωντος and ὁς, and from a full conviction that ἐφανερωθη σαρκι intended or implied Θεος," (that *was manifested in flesh* intended or implied *God*,) " ὁς," (*who*) " has been changed to Θεος," (*God*) " by merely converting the Uncial OC into ΘC, the compend of Θεος.

" Some (says Dr. Burton) connect στυλος και, ε. τ. α. with *what follows:* but Origen in five places connects it with εκκλησια; we have seen, in Annot. to Matt. xxvii. 50, p. 178, what deference is due to the criticism of Origen; and we read in Griesbach's extracts (Symb. Critic. tom. ii. p. 583,) Origen's broken citations from this passage."——" Such loose testimony cannot be admitted as evidence. The true reading therefore is ὁς," *(who,)* " looking back to its antecedent Θεου ζωντος," (*living God,)* " Wetstein states (note tom. ii. p. 330,) of the text of Cyrill, 'Licet *libri editi* nunc habent Θεος ἐφ, *codices tamen, MSS.* et qui ex illis catenas confecerunt, legunt ὁς ἐφανερωθη:' " (that is, the printed editions of Cyrill have Θεος, *God*, and the manuscripts, ὁς, *who:* " such a convicted falsification only raises doubts of the fidelity of other citations of Scripture, in the early *printed* copies of the Fathers."

* —— novæ periochæ initium facit—στυλος και ἑδραιωμα, κ. τ. λ.—Gnomon N. T. tom. ii. p. 1006.

THE UNIVERSALIST.

SEPTEMBER, 1850.

JEREMIAH WHITE.

(*Continued from page* 79.)

It has been stated, that Jeremiah White was a student and afterwards Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Of his life, up to this period, nothing appears to be known. The first mention we have of him, by Dr. Calamy, affirms him to have been "a Fellow of T. C. C., and afterwards Preacher to the Council of State, and Household Chaplain to Oliver Cromwell. After the Restoration, he lived privately, preaching occasionally; but never undertaking any pastoral charge. He died in 1707, at the age of 78." The Doctor informs us, that "he knows not of anything of his writing being printed in his life-time, besides a funeral sermon for Mr. Francis Fuller; and since his death, a treatise of his has been published in octavo, entitled A Persuasive to Moderation and Forbearance in Love among the divided Forms of Christians, in which more of his works are promised." And we are afterwards told, that he, J. White, had, with a great deal of pains and charge, made a collection of the sufferings of the Dissenters, by the Penal Laws, after the Restoration in 1660; which contained an account of the ruin of many thousand families, in the several parts of the kingdom, by the severities of these times. When K. James the Second came to the crown, and gave the Dissenters liberty, he was very much importuned by several to print his account. Some agents of K. James were with him, and made him very considerable offers, if he would publish it: but, as circumstances then stood, he was not to be prevailed upon, for fear of strengthening the Popish interest, "which I mention," says Calamy, "in honour to his memory." After his death, the work now before us was published; a work, which the Doctor characterises as "too unscriptural and too venturesome an hypothesis to be depended on with safety," and which he elsewhere terms "perfect Origenism."

This last sentence is given as a specimen. Who has not heard his friends say, that this hypothesis of Universal Love, resulting in universal salvation, is "unscriptural;" and, when beaten from that ground, take up the other, and shrink from the "*venturesomeness*," to use the Doctor's word, of stating it, and warn against the "*unsafety*" of depending upon it?

Of his life and his writings the foregoing is, we suppose, almost all that is known. There is one little incident recorded, and it has designedly been left to the last. "The celebrated Earl of Rochester, in the midst of his extravagance, both of opinion and practice, was once in his company. White took the opportunity, while discoursing with the Earl about religion and the being of a God, to display the goodness of God in its length and breadth, according to the view of it in the work in question. Upon which the Earl answered "That he could approve of and love such a God as he had represented." And so far was he from drawing any encouragement for his loose principles from hence, that, on this supposition, he at once gave up his cause.

This story is worth thinking about. Few persons doubt, that the unfaithfulness of the Church has been the cause of Dissent. Not that all would have been content to be quiet members thereof, even had she been faithful. But restless spirits, one imagines, would have spent themselves, and would have been found incapable of lasting union, if there had been no ground for separation which approved itself to thoughtful, and stable, and pious minds.

May we not doubt, whether scepticism and infidelity would have been so prevalent had the truth "as it is in Jesus" been faithfully and *purely* taught? had the word of God been always held forth, so held forth, that all might know it uncorrupted by human traditions? We think so. We venture further to think, that the Church is herself responsible for *much*, not all, of the infidelity which has disgraced Christendom. As corruption has spread so has infidelity. Popery and infidelity go hand in hand, and divide the community between them: not the community of laymen alone, but of priests also. And so with the Church of England, and with every other Church.

Is there anything extraordinary in this? When the advocates of any system are inconsistent, and their acts and their words are contradictory, men disbelieve both.

Now the religion of Jesus Christ is of such a nature, that every man finds himself first of all opposed to it in its reality — assumes the attitude of an observer and a judge — and, though he has been previously taught, and holds out a professional acquiescence, perhaps adherence, yet he feels all the animus of an inquirer, all the extraneousness of a critic. He looks upon it from without, and detects himself investigating its pretensions. He turns, for the truth of its doctrines, to the lives of those reputed real, in contradistinction to those who, like himself, are but nominal or custom Christians. And, though he is not in a position to observe accurately or know thoroughly, yet he concludes from what he sees, and decides upon the imperfect evidence of his senses. Our Lord recognizes this peculiarity. "By this," He says, "shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another"—"that they may be one in us, that the *world may know* that thou has sent me." He implies, that all would examine the professions of Christianity, and that they would infer, not from book evidence, but from that which the conversation of believers supplied. For surely no one would dream of insisting, that these things were said of his own times only, and had no reference to these.

When therefore men say that the consequence of unbelief, in the

Scriptural sense, is everlasting suffering, eternal punishment — when they say that the majority are hastening to this eternity of sorrow, and at the same time hold that they themselves are called to be co-workers with God in saving men from such sorrow, and yet sleep quietly in their beds, and feel at liberty to shew little concern about the eternal fate of their neighbours, but very much about the temporary losses and gains of the present — when they say with one breath, that God loves or "is loving to every man," (never-mind *how* — they shall have their own way about the when, the where, and the manner,) and with the next say, that He never loved the great bulk of men, but hated them, and will eternally hate them, and punish them for that reason and no other, (for what they do say amounts to this) — when their theology is full of dodges and evasions, and the infallible word of God, according to them, is full of contradictions which they are called to reconcile in a hundred contradictory ways, each insisting upon his own way or the way of his Church, on pain of everlasting perdition — when thoughtlessly and recklessly "they deal damnation o'er the land," as if it were nothing — when, in a thousand ways, they strain at theological gnats and swallow camels, — when they intrude into every thing, and dogmatise about every thing, and "make the word of God of none effect through their traditions," which they certainly do—when Divinity is a mass of contradiction, and guessing, and presumptuous dogmatism, and the Churches present the aspect of numerous bodies of men "hateful and hating one another," while yet their words and professions are love, can they wonder if others refuse to believe any of them? i. e. can they wonder at infidelity? Yes; it is Christianity that has nourished and brought up infidelity. When the Lord was among men, He ever drew them to Himself: to believe it was only necessary to be near Him, and to listen and observe; but when they left Him to mix again with the world about them, they became as they, and smothered their new emotions. Now the case is reversed. To listen and observe—to study "the Church" which claims to represent her Lord on earth, is to be very near to infidelity. If a man uses his eyes and his ears, he will end by disbelief. Comparison is fatal. And this we believe to be true of "the Church" in all its branches; Greek, Romish, English, Dissenting churches—they are all alike. Speaking of them collectively, we must say that they "hold the truth;" but they "hold it in unrighteousness."

Open the map of the world—colour the countries Christian—look at it attentively—repeat "the year of grace," eighteen hundred and fifty. Now, for eighteen hundred and fifty years, has "the truth," as they say, been proclaimed; and to what purpose? They tell us, in three hundred years it subdued the world; in eighteen hundred, the world has nearly subdued it. As one stands looking at this awful map and repeats our Lord's words, "when the Son of man cometh shall He find faith on the earth?" a new light breaks in upon the intellect. This dark map throws light upon the whole. How many millions of pounds have been spent in promoting Christianity—how many lives have been sacrificed —how much blood shed—how many volumes written—what seas of ink spent—and where is it? The sum expended in support of the Apostles and first missionaries would be a curious fact. There was

much required to crush them. Kings and priests were as lavish of money—money wrung from the labouring man—in those days as in these; and judges and jailors, and magistrates and the military, the palace and the prison, the emperor and the executioner—all were put in requisition at whatever cost—all the apparatus of "order" was hot and bright with work; and small chance appeared for Christianity. These "unlearned and ignorant men" must have had something about them, which does not come into the calculations of human policy. They *beat* the "order"—beat it and all its kings, princes, judges, magistrates, armies, revenues, and all else thereto belonging,—beat them out of the field, i. e. out of the world. So say the "Evidences." And infidelity? —why they beat that too! What a motley crowd they had arrayed against them! In the confused ranks of the discomfited we see all the aforesaid officers of "order," with priests, philosophers, books, and devils. The exchequer with its chancellor; policy and diplomacy with their prime minister, the Devil; the executive with its royal head, and red, military, arm; philosophy with its robes, and pride, and schools; authority with all its pomp and priestcraft—and all were totally routed by a very "few unlearned and ignorant men," and became among the things that had been. They beat them without peerages, or tithes, or mitres, or thrones, or Universities, or philosophies, or books; ay, and they beat them without missionary societies and without stipends. But after eighteen centuries and a half, with every earthly advantage during the greater part of that period, and with some of these advantages which men have now agreed to be furnished by powers not of the earth, what is to be said of the success of Christianity? Of course, an explanation can be given—many explanations. We have one of our own: and venture to think we run no risk of condemnation on account of our belief, that the reason why Christianity has all but disappeared from Africa and Asia; why it has stagnated into something little better than heathenism over great part of Europe; why infidelity has grown up within its own ranks until the very existence of Christianity is now said to be in danger, as "the Church" has been from time immemorial, according to the Bishops; is to be found in the books and sermons, but especially in the lives of Christians—Christians of all Churches and of all names.

Universalism is accused of making infidels, because it has not always succeeded in curing those who had been poisoned by what is called orthodoxy. In this case, however, it silenced and subdued a celebrated unbeliever.

NOHDORN.

ON THE CHERUBIM.

The Cherubim was a compound figure, consisting of the following parts:— Three faces; those of an ox, a lion, and an eagle—each of them the chief of its kind; whence the whole figure is called *Cherubim*, a word which signifies the *likeness*, or *representation, of the great ones*. 2. The face of a man joined to that of the lion, as appears by Ezekiel's description—"As for the likeness

of their faces, they four had the face of a man and the face of a lion on the right side; and they four had the face of an ox on the left side; they four also had the face of an eagle." (i. 10) The same thing is shown by the united faces of the lion and man being inwrought between palm trees, the emblems of victory, on the walls of the temple, a symbol of the body of Christ; on the door, another symbol of Christ; and probably on the veil, which is the flesh of Christ. (Ezek. xli. 18, 19, 25; 2 Chron. iii. 14.) And, if the lion and man signify one person of the Trinity, the two distinct faces of the ox and the eagle must signify the other two persons. 3. The other parts are equally significant: the hands, a proper emblem of the divine operation (Ezek. i. 8); the upright calf's foot, of the rectitude of the divine proceedings (Ezek. i. 7); the outspread wings, of the divine protection (Exod. xxv. 20, xxxvii. 9; 1 Kings, vi. 27, viii. 7; 2 Chron. iii. 12, 13, v. 8; Ruth ii. 12; Ps. xvii. 8, lxi. 4); the wing-enveloped body, of the inscrutability of the divine essence (Ezek. i. 11); the two sets of faces, by which contrivance all at once looked both inwards and outwards, of the divine omnipresence (Exod. xxv. 18; Rev. iv. 6); and the fulness of eyes, of the divine omniscience (Ezek. x. 12; Rev. iv. 6, 8); all, taken together, forming a most correct and comprehensive emblem of the Deity.

The correctness of this explanation receives additional proof from the circumstance, that the entire hieroglyphic was confined to the holy of holies, representing heaven; and that the two-fold cherub, or lion and man only, was exhibited in the holy place outside the veil, representing earth, the scene of Christ's personal ministry: that is, alternated with palm-trees in bloom, on the walls, doors, and veil. See 1 Kings vi. 23—35; Exod. xxvi. 31; Ezek. xli. 17—20; and for the signification, John ii. 21, x. 9; Heb. x. 20; Rev. vii. 9.

"Christ," says Paul, "is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." Heb. ix. 24. Here is an exact analogy, to the same purpose, throughout: the holy places made with hands corresponding to the true holy places, or heaven itself; the Jewish high priest, to Christ; and (what is of chief import) the *faces* of the Cherubim, before which the blood of the sacrifice was sprinkled, to the *presence* of God, in which Christ pleads the merits of his own blood.

This explanation, originally that of a class of writers called Hutchinsonians, though so well supported, has met with a very limited reception; and some objections, thought insuperable, have been urged against it, which it becomes necessary to answer.

1. An objection has been taken from the second commandment, and repeatedly urged without any notice of the answer given to it: namely, that "it immediately vanishes on attentively reading the words of it, Exod. xx. 4—*Thou shalt not make* לך *to thyself any graven image*, &c. ver. 5—*Thou shalt not bow down to them*, &c. Now the Cherubim, whatever they represented, were not made by the people *to themselves*, *i.e.* out of their own head and imagination, and for their own uninstituted use, but were formed by express command, according to a divine pattern, by men divinely inspired for the purpose."...."And, as to the use made of them, the people were so far from

bowing down to or *serving* the four-faced cherubs placed in the holy of holies, that they could not even see them, because they were always separated from the outward tabernacle by a thick veil."—*Parkhurst's Heb. Lex.* where see more. In addition to this, I observe, that God often commands things to be done by particular persons for particular purposes, which he forbids to be done by other persons either for the same or other purposes. He commanded the Cherubim to be made, and put into the holy of holies, and yet he also said, "Cursed be the man that maketh a graven or a molten image—and putteth it in a secret place." (Deut. xxvii. 15.) He ordered a particular compound of oil and spices to be made, and yet he also said, "Whosoever compoundeth any like it, or whosoever putteth any of it on a stranger, he shall be even cut off from his people." (Exod. xxx. 33.) He appointed particular persons to particular offices, and forbids other persons to intrude into those offices. Indeed, the argument militates as much against making the Cherubim at all, as against this symbolical institution of them.

2. A second objection is taken from the acts of worship they are represented as paying in Rev. iv. 8, and v. 9. Parkhurst answers this by considering the worship specified in these texts as *symbolical* rather than real. The objection, however, proves too much; because applicable to other cases, in which neither the import of the symbol nor the nature of the worship can be doubted. A king represents the King of kings; and the Levitical priesthood represented that of Christ; and yet no one ever denied the emblematic character of these offices on account of the worship paid by kings and priests, as men and creatures, to their Creator. The representative use of material objects requires an interpretation agreeable to its nature and limits. With respect to its nature, any property may serve as the foundation of it. Thus, beside the signification already assigned to the cherubic animals, the labouring ox is emblematic of the ministerial office (1 Cor. ix. 9); a lion, of persecutors (2 Tim. iv. 17; 1 Pet. v. 8); and an eagle, of an invading army, particularly of the Romans. (Deut. xxviii. 49.) With respect to its limits, we find in every discourse an intermixture, perhaps an unavoidable intermixture, of the representative and the literal. Thus, if we compare the parable in Ezek. xx. 46—48 with its interpretation in xxi. 1—5, we find many literal terms common to both.

3. Doctor Whitley, who rails at Parkhurst evidently without understanding him, says—"It would be morally impossible, that God should violate his own law in his own temple; and, moreover, physically impossible to represent the infinite, all-wise, all-powerful, and all-sufficient Spirit, by any material object or image whatever." The first part of this objection is answered already; and, by the use of the word "Spirit" in the second, he refutes himself. In fact, the physical impossibility is on the opposite side. "Nihil est in intellectu, quod non prius erat in sensu;" and all language is necessarily formed on this principle, as he himself is obliged to acknowledge. "Matter is earlier and easier observed than spirit; the world which is seen must first instruct us in respect of that which is unseen; and we derive the ground-work and the first principles of our ideas and language concerning what is spiritual and invisible from the material and fleeting objects around us."—*Scheme and Completion of Prophecy*, sect. iii. p. 97, the whole of which is to the same purpose. It is

indeed surprising that the Doctor should make this contradictory objection, when our Lord uses the word "Spirit," the name of a material object, to convey some notion of the divine *immaterial* essence. John iv. 24. The Doctor further objects, that, "in 1 Chron. xxviii. 18, the Cherubim are called God's chariot;" and that "the Shekinah and the Cherubim, combined together, in their grand and ultimate intent and application, shadowed out the Messiah, the Theanthrope or God-man, the Christ of God, seated upon the throne of Israel and of the world, of grace and glory; ruling the church militant and trinmphant, and head over all things to his church; which is peculiarly his throne and his kingdom, and even his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all."—*Ibid.* p. 422, 433. This is opposing a correct explanation of the whole to an equally correct explanation of a part. The heavens, in their three conditions of fire, light, and spirit, are the primary emblems of the Trinity; but this militates nothing against their physical subordination. For example: the material spirit, or air, is an undoubted emblem of the Holy Spirit (Acts ii. 2); and yet, as we read in Psalm xviii, Jehovah "rode on a cherub and did fly; yea, he did fly upon the wings of the wind."—(רוח, the spirit.)

No small collateral verification of the Hutchinsonian explanation of this hieroglyphic is afforded by the heathen corruptions of it set up in their temples as symbols of their false gods; of which Parkhurst has produced many examples. Various others have been given; but I pass them over, as too vague and unsatisfactory, even where partially admissible, to require particular notice.

R. R.

ON THE FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE OF SCRIPTURE.

There are few, if any persons, in any degree acquainted with Scripture, who will not allow that natural things are used therein, in many instances, to shew forth those which are spiritual. For example, what person calling himself a Christian, would deny that the Lamb without blemish, used in the daily sacrifice, is the type of Christ? Or, that the raging ocean is emblematical of the multitude, its roaring being compared to that of the people.

The Hebrew language, as is well known to those who are acquainted with that language, is rich and abundant in figures and types; every word in common use being derived from some quality or resemblance inherent in the thing itself.

It seems that the Almighty, in the childhood of mankind, instructed his people by palpable and visible images, selected by Infinite Wisdom from the treasures of nature; and by a species of representative, in which inanimate objects and living creatures were made to be the actors and sufferers, imparted those eternal truths, which are as important to us, at this present time, as they were to those who received them in ages long past. It also appears that he afterwards proceeded to unfold those truths still farther, by the mouth of his prophets, still serving himself in his divine purpose with the same images which he had used in his former revelations; and that he left it until the literal

fulfilment of most of his earlier revelations had been accomplished, to reveal his will, by the mouths of the Apostles, in a language, in great measure divested of figurative terms; although he afterwards added one more book to the sacred Scriptures, wherein all things relating to the church of Christ are shadowed forth in the same symbolic language which is used in the former parts of the inspired volume.

In many instances, inanimate things are so constructed, and compelled so to act by the laws of their nature, as to shew forth the qualities and acts of things which are spiritual; and again, the actions of men are so overruled as, in many instances, more perhaps than now appear, to foreshew future events, as in the allowed instance of the wives of Abraham, Sarah and Hagar, being made respectively the types of the Church of Zion, and of the Church under the Law. Hence St. Paul says, Gal. iv. 24--26, "*Which things are an allegory; for these are the two covenants, the one from the Mount Sinai which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar, is Mount Sinai in Arabia and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all.*". In the study of historical allegories, we must be careful, on the one hand, not to reduce real history to mere allegory; and, on the other, not to suppose that there may not be further import in many of the transactions which are related in the Old Testament than exactly what may meet the understanding on the first perusal of the holy volume.

With respect to the application or use of the Scripture emblems, there are several rules to be observed, by the neglect of which many expositors have lost themselves. The first of these is, that types are not arbitrary, but have each a fixed and determined sense: for instance, if a tree be a type of a member of the garden of God, it can have no other signification: it may be either a true or a false professor, a fruitful or a barren member; but, in all cases, it is a member of the visible or the invisible church.

Again, prophecy has very frequently many successive fulfilments, like the class of palm trees, which produces a crown every year; or rather a fresh coronet of leaves every season, each one rising from out of that of last year. Of all the prophecies we know, of this peculiar nature, the sabbath is perhaps the most remarkable. This institution, which was in itself a type, has grown in importance by every successive fulfilment, and yet even now, remains to be accomplished in its most glorious form. It must be farther observed, that all prophecy (we do not at present recollect an exception) is always delivered in figurative language. Where it appears not to be so, it is only when the eye of the interpreter merely rests on the natural sense, as in the case of the prediction relating to the birth of Jacob and Esau, wherein the primary and ostensible sense, met with a speedy fulfilment, the spiritual one being even at this distant period incomplete. It therefore is not perhaps too much to say, that *all* prophecy is written in the language of types. Hence the importance of thoroughly understanding the meaning and use of these figures before any farther step is taken in the application of them to actual events; and, although it might prove a pleasing and improving exercise to ascertain how types and figures are used and understood by the ancient heathen and modern oriental

writers, yet, in a study of such infinite importance to the investigation of truth, Scripture must be its own interpreter, and the true application of types to their antitypes, in that case, can only be learned from the sacred writings; although there is little doubt but that many of the most beautiful heathen allegories are deduced from the types of Scripture, and are in consequence more or less correct in measure as they approach unto or depart from the true and perfect rules of allegorical language. These remarks have been made by way of introduction to a subject which appears to the writer of them to have been hitherto too much neglected by believers: namely, a consistent study of the figurative language of Scripture; which it is presumed has not yet been undertaken by any person, whose spiritual apprehension has been cleared of those mists of false doctrine, which have more or less hidden the Saviour from the eyes of almost all interpreters of Scripture from the period of the apostolic age to the present day.

Many good and learned men have indeed endeavoured to elucidate and arrange certain Scripture emblems and figures; but most of these have failed and fallen very far short of the truth, in consequence of their imperfect views of the Saviour of all men, and the other doctrines dependant upon this the most important one.

Although no one natural figure is sufficient to shew Christ our Lord in his fulness, yet it appears that he is made manifest in some of his attributes and qualities, his offices, his acts, and various connexions with mankind, in every beautiful and magnificent figure used in Scripture. In every historic narrative also, in every legal form and ordinance divinely appointed, in fact, in all things which are in heaven, and earth, and under the earth, the manifestation or exhibition by natural objects of this Glorious One may be discerned. The parallel ought not to be traced from the type up to the antitype, but must be studied as it were downwards, from the latter to the former; and therefore all who have hitherto considered the language of types, with limited human views of our Lord and his perfections, can never have succeeded, but in a most imperfect degree, in the explanation of any figurative biblical language. To such the examination of Scripture figures is, as though the woman who had lost her piece of silver, in the parable, had sought it through her darkened house without the aid of a lighted candle, Luke xv. 8.

In selecting an example as an illustration of the truth of the foregoing remarks, some difficulty is experienced, from the vast—the inexhaustible nature of the subject, and the various headings or classifications under which the different orders of types may be arranged. We will however in the first instance, take for our study the natural and very familiar objects incident to Pastoral Life, the imagery employed to describe which being so beautiful and yet so simple, that we may call it, as it were, a leading path to deeper studies; and, in the pursuit of this our proposed plan, let us first ascertain what characters, our beloved Saviour assumes in these fair scenes of nature.

In his united Divine and Human person, he is typified under several heads. He is the Shepherd of the flock, and the fold that embraces and protects them, individually. He is also the Door, by which they are admitted. John x. 7. Again he is the Sheep and the Goat, denoting under these distinct figures, the perfection of the sacrifice of the atonement. He is the Lamb, as the son of the

flock, and the Ram as its Leader; and from him we derive our robe of righteousness as the sheep provides us with clothing from his wool.

We will first speak of our Lord as the Great Shepherd or Prince of Shepherds of the Sheep. Heb. xiii. 20. He who is so sweetly described as the Leader of his flock, Psalm lxxxi. 1,—calling each by its name, John x. 3,—as the provider of green pasturage, Ps. xxiii. 2,—who gathers the lambs with his arm and carries them in his bosom, gently leading those who are with young, Is. xl. 11, having previously laid down his life for the sheep, John x. 15. Here is portrayed the true character of the Divine Mediator, the Saviour in his Godlike nature, the Protector, the Supporter, the Guardian and Leader of his children,who has the power and will to perform all that he has promised.

But there are other Shepherds named besides the Chief Shepherd of Israel: and first the shepherds of Israel, who were an abomination to the Egyptians, Gen. xlvi. 34, which circumstance typifies the true seed lying under the hatred of mankind, or the hostility manifested by the Workers of the Law to the Children of Grace. These Shepherds dwelt in tents indicating thereby their existence in the body or in the "earthly house of this tabernacle;" and, as these tents were often removed and liable to all manner of vicissitudes, so the human nature of such shepherds was liable to change. Hence the beautiful prophecy against the Shepherds of Israel in Ezek. xxxiv., by which we are admonished of the grievous failure of the pastors of the flocks, which obliges the Chief Shepherd to take the management of his flock into his own hands. "And I will set up one Shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David" (the beloved); "he shall feed them, and he shall be their Shepherd. And I will make with them a covenant of peace,and will cause the evil beasts to cease out of the land: and they shall dwell safely in the wilderness and sleep in the woods. And I will make them and the places round about my hill a blessing; and I will cause the shower to come down in his season; there shall be showers of blessing. And the tree of the field shall yield her fruit, and the earth shall yield her increase, and they shall be safe in their land, and shall know that I am the Lord, when I have broken the bands of their yoke, and delivered them out of the hands of those that served themselves of them." See the whole chapter.

A similiar passage occurs in Jeremiah xxiii. 3, 4, including a promise of the reestablishment of the inferior shepherds. "And I will gather the remnant of my flock out of all countries whither I have driven them, and will bring them again to their folds; and they shall be fruitful and increase. And I will set up shepherds over them which shall feed them: and they shall fear no more, nor be dismayed, neither shall they be lacking, saith the Lord. As it is a fundamental rule, in the language of types, that every important figure has its evil as well as its good signification, hence we must look for shepherds opposed to the Shepherds of Israel; such as are called *Idol* Shepherds, Zech. xi. 17,—who cannot stand before God, Jer. x. 44,—who will be broken to pieces with their flocks, Jer. lvii. 23,—and who, as eaters of the fat of their sheep, Zech. xi. 6, prove themselves to be hirelings and not true shepherds; for they leave the sheep to the wolf and flee. John x. 12.

We next proceed to consider those figures which are supplied by flocks in general, and of these there appear to be three distinct headings.

Primarily, a flock represents the human race. "And ye my flock, the flock of my pasture, are *men*; and I am your God saith the Lord God." Ezek. xxxiv. 31.

In the Hebrew there are as many as six words, which, in our English version, are translated flock; but, of these, only three require our immediate attention. The first Hebrew word rendered flock, is so called from its fruitfulness. It is to abound with sheep and goats; and hence it is used more frequently for sheep than for goats, from the greater fruitfulness of the former.

"Thy pastures are clothed with flocks, Ps. lxv. 13. "That our sheep may bring forth thousands, and ten thousands in our streets." Ps. cxliv. 13. As the holy flock, as the flock of Jerusalem in her solemn feasts; so shall the waste cities be filled with flocks of men, and they shall know that I am the Lord." Ezek. xxxvi. 38.

The second word used as flock, in our English translation, would be best described as a flock of sheep or herd of kine set apart, or separated, from the mass of the kind to which its members belong. The Bridegroom, in the Canticles, is described as having hair like to a flock of Goats of this description, Cant. iv. 1; and teeth, as such a chosen flock of Sheep. Cant. vi. 6.

The true shepherd is mentioned as more especially feeding this flock, Is. xl. 11; and it is also called the Lord's flock, Jer. xiii. 17, which is for a time carried away captive. The ideal meaning of the Hebrew word is—to arrange, to dispose, as an army in battle array.

The third Hebrew word is more commonly translated *cattle*, and properly used only of oxen and sheep, (beasts of burthen being excepted,) and a promise is given that the day shall come, when thy cattle shall feed in large pastures. "Then shall he give the rain of thy seed, and thou shalt sow the ground withal; and bread of the increase of the earth, and it shall be fat and plenteous: in that day shall thy cattle feed in large pastures." Isa. xxx. 23.

In these descriptions, we must pay particular attention to the different orders of flocks. The most fruitful and abundant are not the chosen ones—the little band set forth in battle array—the Lord's own flock, to the which the Bridegroom is likened: nor is it composed of the same as the oxen and sheep, for whom pasturage will also be found.

The Lion and Bear that seized the Lamb out of David's flock, 1 Sam. xvii. 34, took it from the separated herd; but David went out after them and smote them, and delivered them from their mouth.

It is of this especial flock, the Prophet Zechariah says, "For the Lord of Hosts hath visited his Flock the house of Judah, and hath made them as his goodly horse in the battle" Zech. x. 3.

There is also a lament for these chosen ones. "How do the beasts groan! the herds of cattle or *flocks* are perplexed, because they have no pasture, yea the flocks of sheep are made desolate." Joel i. 18.

The Prophet Jeremiah, in speaking of this time, says, "And mine eye shall weep sore, and run down with tears, because the Lord's flock is carried away captive. Lift up your eyes, and behold them that come from the North: where is the flock that was given thee, thy beautiful flock?" Jer. xiii. 17, 20. "Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the Isles afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him as a shepherd

doth his flock," Jer. xxxi. 10; and in Ezek. xxxiv. 12, 13, "As a shepherd seeketh out his flock in the day, that he is among his sheep, that are scattered; so will I seek out my sheep, and will deliver them out of all places, where they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day. And I will bring them out from the people, and gather them from the countries, and will bring them to their own land, and feed them upon the mountains of Israel by the rivers, and in all the inhabited places of the country."

M. M. S.

(To be continued.)

ELECTION AND UNIVERSAL SALVATION.

The phrases "distinguishing, discriminating grace" and "electing love" are familiar as household words among many Christians; and, even among those who hold the doctrine of Universal Salvation, we believe there are some who do not perceive any inconsistency in their use of them.

Now that God, in the exercise of his Sovereignty, and in the moral government of his creatures, does distinguish and discriminate, we are not about to deny: on the contrary, we strenuously maintain the affirmative; but we verily believe, that the phrases we have quoted are as destitute of truth, as they are unwarranted by the phraseology of Scripture. No where do the Sacred Writers speak of these attributes of the divine benignity: and no wonder, for were they to do so, what would become of the doctrine which they so plainly assert, and which we, as Universalists, so highly prize?

God's love is his nature: it is therefore boundless. It comprehends *me*, or it would be limited; it includes *you*, or it would be partial. It is the bow in the cloud, overarching all; and like the bow, it is manifested in varied hues: to our weakness, it is pity; to our dependence, it is support; to our sorrow, it is sympathy; to our waywardness, it is forbearance; to our sins, it is forgiveness; and it is this to each and to all, even to the chief of sinners, and it will "be manifested in due time."

Discriminating grace? Why what is there to discriminate? As partakers of the same corrupt nature, is there, can there be, any essential difference between one man and another? Is God's hatred of sin discriminating? Surely with as great propriety may we talk of God's discriminating hate as of his "distinguishing love." But he "hath concluded all under sin;" for "there is none righteous, no, not one."

The predestined conformity of man, now perverse and opposed, to the divine likeness, was an universal predestination, originating in the nature of Him who *is love*. And who does not rejoice in prospect of that entire subjugation of man to his maker, when his predestined conformity shall be realized in universal harmony with the love or law of God? when every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that Jesus is Lord to the glory of God the Father?

Let us adduce a passage or two, out of many, from the divine testimony, in confirmation of our view.—"God is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works." "God sent his Son into the world, not to condemn the

world, but that the world through him might be saved." "By the grace of God, he tasted death for every man." "That he might be the first-born of every creature." "God is love." "God so loved the world."—If in such passages as these God's undiscriminating undistinguishing love be not expressed, we know not what hope the majority of the human family can have of salvation. We do not overlook the statement, "God loved the Church," and similar expressions of God's regard for his chosen ones; but with the testimony we have just cited before us, we can scarcely conceive, that, because it is said "God loved the Church," that therefore he loves nobody else: and yet some of our "discriminating" ones would have us think so!

The doctrine of Election, however, is one of the grand truths of Revelation; and we have now to prove, that it is in perfect harmony with our view of the divine goodness, and has its essential part assigned to it in the order of the divine manifestation.

The fact of the doctrine being admitted, we have to answer the question, how is it to be accounted for? We reply, that, as a part of the divine manifestation,—or the manifestation of the divine love—it originates in the divine purpose which is formed according to the dictates of infinite wisdom. The eternal purpose requires that the manifestation of the divine all-sufficiency —"the grace of God to all men"—be progressive. This is only analogous to all the modes of the operations of God in creation and providence. The progressiveness of the manifestation originates, we may say, necessitates, the election and calling of a chosen people. Hence the existence of a church in which the Almighty has made himself known, and which as "*the first fruits,*" points to that ultimate disclosure of his perfections which will issue in the harvest "*of God's creatures.*"

The Son of God, as "Son of man," is the elect one in whom God's soul delighteth: but this election is not an end but a means; and through the election of Jesus, the church is elected, for "no man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him." The casting off of the typically elect nation—the Jews—was "the riches of the Gentiles," and can we doubt, for a moment, that the church is elected as a means to the final consummation, in which "the Glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together?"

We think our view is sustained by much in the writings of the apostle Paul. For instance (Ephes. i.) the election of the church is ascribed to "*the good pleasure of his will,*"...."*according to the riches of his grace, wherein he hath abounded towards us in all wisdom and prudence.*" And then he proceeds to show how the predestination of the church "to the praise of his glory" was connected with "the dispensation of the fulness of times," when "all would be gathered together in Christ, both which are in heaven and on the earth, even in him." Ephes. iii. 10, may also be consulted. In Coloss. i. is asserted the preeminence of Christ, and the universal blessedness connected with his exaltation, followed immediately by an allusion to the partial and preliminary manifestation of his character in the salvation of the Church.

In sum: *God is love,*—his manifestation of himself is progressive,—to a part first, and through a part to the whole. This manifestation is the result, not of

anything distinguishing, discriminating, or electing in his love, which would be to say that his nature is something different to one man from what it is to another,—but of his purpose or will, which is universally found in consistency with his nature, or, as the inspired apostle has it, "*according to the riches of his grace.*" Thus the elected church is not an end, but a means towards the full and complete manifestation of "the love of God." And those privileges which are now peculiar to the chosen ones;—the freedom from condemnation in which they rejoice; the sanctification and belief of the truth, which is, in them, the earnest of the divine nature; the knowledge of the fact that through Jesus, who is one with them, they are one with the Father;—are privileges with which all the guilty children of Adam shall be finally invested; for "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound."

The doctrine we have thus briefly and imperfectly set forth we believe to be the doctrine of Scripture: and how different from that perverted view of it which fosters pride, bigotry, selfishness, self-righteousness, and narrow-mindedness! and which, in its effect upon those who are not so satisfied with themselves as to conceive that they are the special favourites of heaven, engenders doubt, anxiety, alarm, and not unfrequently *despair*. Happy are those who, while enjoying and rejoicing in a present personal salvation, are anticipating, on the authority of Him who cannot lie, and who has sworn by himself, the glorious period when the whole creation shall, with themselves, be delivered from the bondage of corruption; and who, in the fact of their own salvation, behold the earnest and the pledge of final universal holiness and happiness.

Z.

FIRST PRINCIPLES.

As nonentity cannot produce entity, it is acknowledged, that something must have always existed, or have had no beginning.

What then is this something? is it intelligent or unintelligent? is it matter or mind? or is it the aggregate, which we call the universe, including both?

The universe is a connected system, the construction of which shows a unity of design unfailingly adapted to ends, or purposes, indicating consummate power, wisdom, and goodness.

Are these the attributes of mind or matter? of finite or infinite mind? Evidently the last.

Has this infinite mind, which we call God, left his creature, man, to the unaided capabilities of his reason for the attainment of that knowledge and guidance essential to his well being, or has he superadded a revelation for these purposes?

Certain writings, called the Old and New Testament, are said to contain such a revelation. What are the proofs of its genuineness?

They are great, numerous, and generally admitted; but, as there are some deniers of this validity, I shall press on their consideration one, from among them all, as alone sufficient. Revelation, in proportion to the degree in which it is duly received, has always carried with it civilization, peace, prosperity,

and happiness; where rejected or corrupted, their opposites; and where all vestiges of it are lost, man has sunk into the Savage state, without either the ability or the will to raise himself above it. Yea, the infidel himself proves the truth of revelation in the very act of denying it; as, without the knowledge first imparted by it, he would have no ideas beyond those of sensible objects; he would be a mere animal, incapable of comprehending an intellectual question; or of arguing either for or against it.

R. R.

RELIGION AND INSANITY.

The following table, taken from an exchange paper, shows the number of persons made insane by religion in different States compared with those whose insanity was produced by other causes.

Asylums.	*Whole No.*	*Caused by Religion.*	
New Hampshire Asylum.	104	10	
Worcester Hospital, Mass.	1160	148	11 yrs.
Utica Asylum, N. Y.	276	57	1 "
Eastern Asylum, Va.	135	8	1 "
Western Asylum, Va.	155	11	1 "
Ohio Lunatic Asylum.	473	57	5 "
Penn. Hospital, 1842	176	13	1 "
" " 1843	439	21	1 "
" " 1844	502	28	1 "
" " 1845	769	35	1 "
" " 1846	936	42	1 "
" " 1847	1,196	50	1 "
New York Asylum, 1842	408	54	1 "
Bloomingdale Asylum, "	179	14	1 "

Here are several hundred persons whose insanity is to be attributed to a *false* religion; for no one can suppose that the true Gospel ever made a mad-man. A good tree does not bear such fruits, a sweet fountain does not send forth bitter water. And yet, the advocates of this mad-house religion coolly talk to us about our heresy! and assure the public that *they* are the depositories of Christ's word, when in fact he never made any man insane by his teachings!

Star in the West.

PAUL A HERETIC.

Yes, the Apostle Paul was a great heretic in the eyes of religious people around him. In their view, he preached heresy of the worst kind—a dreadful, immoral, soul-destroying heresy. He himself says on the subject, "But this I confess unto thee, that after the way they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets."

But in what did his great heresy consist? That he preached something differ-

ent from the Jewish people is certain, else they would not have opposed him and called him a heretic.—What kind of heresy then was it? Let him answer—hear his language! "For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe." Was there ever such an awful heresy heard of before! Paul believe God the Saviour of all men! What! and suffer reproach too for it? So he says reader; he tells you plainly, that he suffered reproach, or in other words, was called a heretic because he believed God will save all mankind. But he adds, that he believed all things written in the "law and the prophets." But what have the law and the prophets to do with universal salvation?—Peter answers that question. "And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: whom the heaven must receive until the times of the restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began."

After reading these declarations, who can doubt that Paul was a heretic? Why, it is as plain that he was, as that words express his meaning. And not only so, but if he lived on earth now he would be called a heretic. We are called so, for believing precisely as he did. Wherever we go and preach, the cry goes up, heresy! heresy!! heresy!!!

But there is one consolation for us, brethren; it so happens that we are just such heretics as were Paul, Peter, John, the Prophets of God, and all the Apostles. We are therefore in excellent company; and this being the case, we can well bear the reproach. Reproach did we say? Rather the honour we should have said, of having given us the same name that was given the inspired teachers, by the people who believe just as did *their* opposers.

Ibid.

UNIVERSALISM THE COMFORTER.

It may be a difficult matter to explain to the understanding of a person who has been erroneously educated, all parts of the Bible so as to harmonise with universal and efficient grace. But there is one position that is always safe to take—it is this, that *whatever* the Bible does mean, it means nothing *opposed* to the character and providence of God, as beheld in nature. His character is to be the standard by which all sentiments and interpretations are to be tested.

So in regard to the doctrine of Universalism. We may not be able to prove its truth from the Scriptures to the satisfaction of all men; but this much we can do, we can show that no human heart can be satisfied and sustained, especially in moments of sorrow, with any other doctrine. This has been demonstrated again and again.

The writer had the unspeakable worth of our views brought most forcibly to his mind a few days since, while in conversation with a member of the Presbyterian church.

The gentleman desired us to give him some of the proofs which weighed most in our own mind, in favour of the final redemption of all men. We felt

happy in having so good an opportunity, and of course did not fail to improve it faithfully.

Among other arguments, we supposed the case of a father that had buried children, and who left no evidence of regeneration—and submitted the question, whether, in view of their condition, he could really be happy, and say amen. Will any other doctrine, said we, do under such circumstances, but this despised system of Universalism? We pressed this question.

The anxious father showed great feeling. He was troubled in spirit. He was sincere—he could not be a pharisee, and believe that God looked with compassion especially on him and his family. We never shall forget his anxious countenance when he said, "*You have touched my case!* I have buried two children who gave no evidence of conversion. I cannot believe that they are lost."

In health and wealth men despise Universalism. But usher in an hour of darkness—to what do they fly? Here ye shall find rest. H. J.

Ibid.

QUESTIONS WELL ASKED.

Br. Ballou, of the Universalist Watchman, under the head of *Questions to Partialist Preachers*, thus proceeds to ask:

1. Do you, or do you not allow, that there is no word in the original Old Testament Scriptures which denoted a place of endless misery?

2. If the Hebrew word *sheol* is, or was not the name of your place of endless misery, from Adam to Christ, was your hell nameless for more than 4000 years?

3. If the doctrine of endless hell was not revealed as the penalty of the moral law under the old dispensation, is it revealed under the more merciful dispensation of the Gospel, founded on "the better promises, even the sure mercies of David"?

4. If neither *sheol* of the Old Testament, nor the *hades* of the New is the name of a place of endless torment, what was the name of your endless hell in times when the Scriptures were written? Was it then nameless?

5. What reasons have you for supposing that *gehenna* in the New Testament, means a place of future endless punishment, rather than misery, calamity and destruction in this world? Is not Tophet or the valley of Hinnon in Isa. 19th ch. used as a subject of comparison, with which to describe the destruction of Jerusalem or the Jewish people?

6. How do you make it appear, that *gehenna* is a prison of endless torture in the future world?

7. Do you not know, that *hades*, the same place the rich man was in, is to be entirely destroyed? Is there to be another hell after hades is destroyed?

Ibid.

---

1 Tim. iii. 16.—"Seen by angels"—the prophets and apostles..... By these, says the apostle, God in Christ was seen,.....and by them, his witnesses, he was preached unto the Gentiles.....And, lest they might be disposed to envy the lot of his chosen messengers, who had seen him with their eyes,..... his own especial word has been recorded for their—I had better say—our comfort; for their case is ours. "Blessed are they who have not seen, and yet have believed." Arnold's Sermons, vol. ii. p. 110, 111.

HOW THEY PROPAGATE LIBERAL DOCTRINES IN ITALY.

At one of the private meetings of a religious association of Boston, during the late anniversaries, a gentleman long resident in Italy was present, and detailed the process by which the Bible and religious tracts, though contraband, were disseminated among the people. It appears that enlightened Italians conceiving that a change of religion is necessary to the existence of political liberty, have such a perfect system of secret organization that they carry on their operations with complete success, despite the bulls of the Pope, or vigilance of his emissaries. The great doctrines of Christianity are placarded in the streets in handbills at night, by an unknown hand, or thrown into houses and public places, in little tracts, with some attractive caption, and are sure to be read, and produce their effect. The mystery that attends the manner of their propagation gives them interest of itself. Those who cannot read are sure to find one at hand to read for them.

ON NATURAL RELIGION.

We often hear the terms Natural and Revealed Religion coupled together, and Rom. i. 20 is thought to assert the reality of the former. But this arises from attaching a mistaken sense to the preposition απο, *from*, the unequivocal rendering of which would be *since*; as it is in Matt. xxiv. 21, and Heb. ix. 26. I regard Natural Religion as a "daw in borrowed feathers." It is generally overlooked, that all the systems, which have been written under this title, are the productions of men who have had the advantage of that revelation, which was given at the beginning, gradually enlarged, and not wholly lost even among the most heathen nations. I believe, that all idea of a First Cause, is traceable to this Revelation; and when the supposed discoveries of what is called Natural Religion are set up independently of it, that we forsake the fountain of living waters, and hew out to ourselves cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water." Jer. ii. 13. What man discovers, man improves. If therefore religion had been of human discovery, it would, like the arts and sciences, have advanced under human cultivation. On the contrary, we find religion corrupted more and more under every dispensation. It is also a fact, that, in proportion as Revelation is lost, civilization is lost with it; and the ability, or even the inclination, to reascend in the scale of intellect and society. Better therefore, instead of losing ourselves in the mazes of our own speculations, to endeavour, by the rules of just interpretation, to ascertain the meaning of the whole *word of God*, which contains every necessary information relating either to our present or future well being.

"When the idea of the Divine Existence has once been admitted into the mind, nothing is more easy than the discovery of innumerable proofs of it. Naturalists and Metaphysicians employ it in the construction of their several systems, and unconsciously avail themselves of the light, which it diffuses over their reasonings, even when undertaking by *a priori* or *a posteriori* arguments to establish the fact; but it remains to be seen at what results they would arrive, if they were to commence their labours totally uninfluenced by any such previous notion. Certain it is, that, how extensively soever the belief in a Deity has obtained in the world—and few indeed have been the exceptions—it cannot be shown that it has, in any one instance, resulted from argument, or that any individual ever acquired it by applying his mental powers to an investigation of the phenomena of nature." *Henderson's Divine Inspiration, p.* 8.

R. R.

POETRY.

PEACE AS A RIVER.—Isaiah xlviii. 18.

Not like the *cloud*, whose misty fold
Gathers around some mountain height;
Its graceful wreaths are thin and cold,
Ever most dim to nearest sight.
Its golden haze decks sunlit skies,
Or glows beneath the setting day,—
But night shall dim its glorious dyes,
The wind shall drive it far away.

Not like a *shower*, whose freshening drops
Wake to new life the sun-parched day,
Whose rustle in the tall tree-tops
Sends heart-thrills to each quivering spray:
Though rainbows rise to span the scene,
Though grateful songs its welcome speak,
Sinking from sight that crystal sheen,
Tomorrow thou in vain may'st seek.

Not like the *brook*, whose onward rush,
So full of sparkling, noisy glee,
Awake from emulous birds a gush
Of ringing, wild-wood ecstacy:—
Alas for flowers, that on its bank,
Hang their bright heads, and drooping, die!
The summer's sun its waters drank,
And now its pebbly bed is dry.

Not like a *wave*, whose measured swell,
Breaks gently on the silver sand,
Or, gathering might beneath the wing
Of tempests, smites the echoing strand:
Wave after wave may seek the shore,
And on their wealth of waters urge.
A few brief hours—then turns the tide,
And backward rolls the inconstant surge.

But like a *river*, calm and clear,
A stately river, full and free,
Whose broad expanse, serenely spread,
The blue sky's mirror well may be,
Yet with a steady current's force
Is ever hastening to the sea:—
No vexing wind, no ebbing tide,
No shallow sources quickly dried,
Have power to stay its onward course:
Such is the PEACE *thine heritage shalt be*
Peace like a RIVER *gives thy God to thee!*

Boston Trumpet.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

SIR,—I have read with much interest occasional extracts from the *Christian Witness* and other periodicals which you give us, to shew the opinion entertained of Universalism by the religionists which that and the other periodicals represent; and also to shew the system of argument adopted by them to overthrow the faith which you and I hold in God's unbounded love. Their argument (so far as appears) is exactly the same as that by which Wesley is said, by his admirers, to have damaged irreparably the system of Ultra Calvinism. Passing over the arguments which we offer for our faith, they take the grand principle, and by a *reductio ad absurdum*, assuming extreme cases, and manufacturing what are thought "telling anecdotes," expose as they think the weakness of our cause. But will they abide the same test? It is easy to say that wicked men would be encouraged in their wickedness: it seems witty to say to a Universalist, "If thy doctrine be true we do not need to hear thee, if it be false we do not wish." But the man who could write this, true or false, must be fearfully shallow as a divine, or thoughtless, or else, what is infinitely worse, disingenuous. If it be false, it has at least as secure a foundation in Scripture as most other articles of our faith,—tends as much as any to the honour and glory of God,—and has more in it of "peace on earth and good will towards men" than *any* other. And if it be true, what can be so cheering, so soothing, so calculated to reconcile us to the hardships of our present lot, as the knowledge that those hardships are but temporary; and that the darkness around mankind shall ultimately be succeeded by the brightness of God's "uplifted countenance?"

Certainly they are thoughtless, or shallow, or narrow, dark, miserable men, who sneer at the belief of God's unchanging love to the world. And as for the *argumentum ad absurdum* which they are so fond of, will they abide by it? Surely one may say with as much fairness of Calvinism, that "if it be true we do not need it, if false we do not desire it." For if men are either saved or damned from all eternity (ante) and come into the world as "elect" or "reprobate" where is the use of disturbing them about it? And the wretched subterfuges of modern Calvinism are absurd enough without any reductio. And what is Arminianism? or Wesleyanism? Can one evade the difficulties of "grace and freewill upon their hypothesis? May we not fairly charge both sides—both the predestinarian and the freewiller—back through the long history of the controversy in connection with Christianity; may we not fairly charge

both sides with dishonouring God? Not intentionally of course, nor hypocritically, but yet as fatally to mankind.

I know not if your readers have seen a beautiful paraphrase of the fifty-first Psalm by the late Bishop Shuttleworth; but, if they have, let me ask them in all candour whether, if he whose heart God has touched naturally says thus, God himself will be below him in holy all-embracing love? or the power of God be unable to achieve what His wisdom approves, and His love desires?

"Oh! thou who lov'st the wretch to spare,
Whom sin has led astray,
Hear, righteous God thy suppliant's prayer,
And wash his stains away."

Now what is the foundation of this godlike hymn? is it not God's love to sinners *as such*? And, oh! is there not something inexpressibly horrible, when the soul rises with such a theme, and being told that it is not *every* sinner God thus loves—not *every* wretch whom sin has led astray? Does not the whole man revolt from the statement?

The only door of escape here is the old subterfuge (for such allow me to call it) that "of course it is a mystery"—that "we cannot *now* understand it"—that "we must leave it"—that "the Bible plainly declares it, and there we rest." Here is the point—here the "Universalist" joins issue with them. If the Scriptures do plainly declare it, we bow at once unreservedly; but, if not, then the doctrine shall not pass. We say the Scriptures do *not* declare it, but the contrary. To the law and to the testimony therefore be the appeal—there we cheerfully meet them. But let us have no sneering, gentlemen, if you please. We are your equals *in every sense*. We know what we hold and why we hold it. And our souls are as valuable as yours. And God is our God. And men are all our brothers, "bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh." There is but "one blood." *We* have no selfish or party creed. We wish to open our hearts as we can to the greatness of God's love, and we would be glad to raise our wretched brother to the same contemplation, certain as we are that that love uplifted on the Cross shall yet draw them all to him.

Believe me, Sir,
Yours faithfully,
NOHDORN.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

DEAR SIR,—I do not know if you approve of "Queries" being inserted, but I think if on useful and important subjects, whether answered or not, they may lead to profitable reflection with calm dispassionate Christians.

The one I now submit can be met by a few lines, no attempt being made by circumlocution to *evade* its *explicit* statement.

I need not tell you, there is a small branch of Christians who have given themselves the distinctive appellation of "*Particular Baptists.*"* These persons will invite ministers of other Sects to *preach* in their pulpits, and also members of other churches to *pray* in their prayer meetings, but will not, *in any case*, permit either ministers or members to sit down at *their* Lord's table.

Without entering into that never to be settled bitter question amongst them all, which *mode* of using water is to be called "*Baptism*," my problem to be solved is, simply on another principle, namely

THE QUERY.

As the Holy writers of the Scriptures were all *inspired Jews*, men of God, of the *seed of Abraham exclusively*, and *all held their authority, by the Divine commission from God direct, with supernatural endowments*, where is the *proof that they transferred their commission to any Gentile*, and who was *the first Gentile that can be produced, in the New Testament*, that *baptized either Jew or Gentile?*

Whilst any one may be entitled to attempt an answer, I think your pages should not be *wasted* by any respondent who would *moot the question with sophism* instead of *meeting it* in a *decidedly definite Christian way*.

AMOR VERITATIS.

---

* The appropriateness of the designation "Particular Baptists" to the sect our correspondent alludes to by that term cannot be questioned, they are *particular* enough; but we believe there are many advocates of "open communion" among the Particular Baptists (so called), the term "Particular" being employed in contradistinction to "General," in reference to the doctrine of Redemption; the one denoting the Calvinistic, and the other the Arminian notion.—ED.

THE UNIVERSALIST.

OCTOBER, 1850.

TRUE CHRISTIANITY A PRACTICAL RELIGION.

ARTICLE IV.

Having now taken a view of the principal varieties of the prevalent perversions of the gospel, which though they may be sometimes expressed in the words of the Apostolic testimony have a meaning totally different from what that was intended to convey, and which meaning may be discovered more or less easily by an examination of the professed sentiments of those who hold such doctrines, we now direct our attention to the other class of cases in which such perversions of doctrine are less obvious or cannot even be detected, but in which there appears to be a deficiency of the practical consequences to be expected as the result of a knowledge of the truth.

There are cases in which the perversions of doctrine are less obvious than in those we examined in our last article, for there may be a difference of meaning attached to a particular statement by different individuals, though it may not be easy to point out distinctly or to demonstrate in what that difference consists. Men can communicate their sentiments to each other only through the medium of words; yet so varied are the forms of expression, that the same meaning may be attached to different forms of words, and different sentiments may be expressed in one specific phraseology. It would be pedantic and illiberal to expect sentiments always to be expressed in precisely the the same way, and it would be not less latitudinarian and unprincipled to attribute the same meaning to a particular form of words when other circumstances appear to indicate the contrary.

Such less obvious perversions of the gospel would, if they were elucidated, probably resolve themselves into some variety of those we pointed out in our last article, which may be classified under two heads, and for convenience designated as the Arminian or Legal and the Calvinistic or Antinomian. Amongst Partialists making a fair though unsatisfactory profession of the gospel we should most readily suspect the existence of the former kind of error, amongst Universalists of the latter. The former would produce a tendency to Phariseeism,—a secret feeling in the individual, notwithstanding his professed belief

that God's mercy was entirely gratuitous, that there was something better about himself than about others, which, though it might be only the effect of the grace of God manifested to him, it was satisfactory to think, shewed at least that God's favour was not thrown away upon him, and a cause of thankfulness that he was not now as other men are. The latter would produce a degree of practical Sadduceeism,—a private persuasion that sin was no great affair after all, and that the revelation of the mercy of God, though professedly the most joyful tidings ever communicated to man, was really of less value than the good things of this life; and that consequently any expression of gratitude to God for his goodness in sending his Son into the world was unnecessary, if it involved a sacrifice of these good things of any importance, or required anything more than words.

Both these classes of individuals are ignorant of the full meaning of the statement that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners. The former class are more or less blind to the importance of the statement that the purpose of Christ's coming into the world was *to save sinners;* to rescue them from that destruction which was the doom of all alike as sinners without distinction or exception,—of all alike standing on one broad level guilty before God. The latter class forget that it was for such a purpose Christ Jesus came into the world,—God's own well beloved Son,—one with the Father; that sin was so grievous in God's sight that he spared not his own Son but delivered him up for us all, that by his sacrifice sin might be put away. The apostolic testimony though expressed in few words is pregnant with meaning; every word has an import, and misapprehension may arise from inattention to the force of any one of them. Christ Jesus—came—into the world,—to save—sinners. It was Christ Jesus! or the anointed one, Jehovah the Saviour, God manifest in flesh;—he came! there was need for his coming, for the world was without him, perishing, while he was with his Father;—into the world! here, amongst us, men, inhabitants of this earth;—to save! this was *his* work, he alone could do it, not men themselves nor any other under heaven;—sinners! men, lost, needed salvation; it was for sinners only he came; if there were any not sinners he came not for them, but to seek and to save that which was lost. The Apostolic testimony is not that *a* Christ came, or that Christ Jesus *was* in the world, (as it were a matter of course or of justice or necessity,) or that he came *somewhere*, or that he came *to help* to save, or that he came to save *men*, whether some or all. Not one of these is the Apostolic gospel though many of them are held as such; but it is, (and not one word can be omitted or altered,) that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; or that the Anointed one Jehovah the Saviour came of express purpose into this our world to save entirely and to the uttermost sinners, or those who, broadly and and without reservation, were guilty and therefore perishing and in need of salvation.

But we must now address ourselves to the consideration of the causes of the failure of the practical influence of Christianity in those cases in which the gospel in its simplicity and purity is professed, and appears in its fulness and sufficiency to be understood. We have before observed

that the Scriptures not only state doctrines through which principles are implanted, but communicate precepts by which these principles are to be carried into effect. They also suggest, admonish, exhort and reprove. In Apostolic language all Scripture is given "for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." And when they are not employed for all these purposes they are neglected for ends for which they were designed by their author, and evils of the most serious character will inevitably follow from such neglect.

The knowledge of the gospel,—the manifestation of God's love to man and of his relation to him as a Father, we have already said, inspires principles in man different from those which were communicated by the first exhibition of relationship between them These were fear of God as a lawgiver and judge, and trust in himself for the continuance of the blessings he possessed. The knowledge of the gospel on the other hand inspires love to God for the blessings he has given and has in store, and confidence that all the evils he at present inflicts are only subservient to good. Man, under both covenants was made the subject of communications of the Divine will for his own benefit; under the old dispensation these were matters of law to the observance of which he was impelled by the fear of penalties or the hope of reward, under the new they are matters of privilege to which he is invited and exhorted as manifestations of his love. The one inspires the fear of a subject, the other the filial confidence of a child, the cheerful but reverential submission due to an Almighty Father. But man is as fitly addressed by precept in the one case as in the other; the believer has as much need for precepts for his guidance as the unbeliever, for he is possessed of the same nature, being impelled by the same propensities, moved by the same passions, endowed with the same feelings, prompted by the same impulses, influenced by the same motives. He is also like him naturally ignorant of what is most conducive to his own benefit and liable to the same errors of judgment. He is in all these respects the same, and differs not in any of these emanations of his nature being changed, but in the possession of new and higher principles by which these are regulated, controlled or overcome.

He is therefore, equally as the unbeliever, a fitting subject to be addressed by law, though only subordinately to his position as the object of "nurture and admonition in the Lord." He is placed in similar circumstances, exposed to the same trials, and subject to like penalties. He may not therefore forget that such is his position, although he occupies a higher one in knowing that such relations are only subservient to a higher capacity in which he stands, that he is not merely the subject of the Almighty but his child. But so long as he is possessed of this body of flesh and an inhabitant of this world, his carnal propensities will ever be most constantly operative and require the most perpetual attention.

Accordingly the Scriptures are full of precepts for the guidance of those who acknowledge their authority, exhortations to attend to them, and warnings against their neglect. The history, law and polity of God's own chosen people have been preserved for our instruction in things pertaining to practice as much as the various revelations and

types in or through which God has revealed his character and manifested his procedure towards the human race, and by which he imparts new principles. The New Testament abounds in preceptive instruction; Jesus himself expounded the old Testament law, opened it up in the fulness of its spirit and illustrated it by his example. The Apostolic writers while they lay down principles do not neglect to shew how these are to be carried out in practice, and while they vindicate doctrine from error and perversion, also warn against error or neglect in conduct. Men are ever prone to go from one extreme to another, and the epistles appear to have been written to correct such errors, sometimes warning those to whom they were addressed against supposing that their good works in any way contributed to their salvation, at other times against supposing that a mere profession of belief in the work of Jesus Christ was really belief, exhorting them to manifest their faith in God's goodness by something better calculated to produce conviction in the minds of their fellow men.

The Lord Jesus while on earth exhibited himself as a great practical teacher. He never dissociated doctrine and practice, nor gave either of them directly or indirectly an undue prominence. He taught his disciples that they were the salt of the earth,—the light of the world, and exhorted them to let their light so shine before men that they might see their good works and glorify their Father who is in Heaven. He gave them for their rule to do to others as they would that others should do to them. There is not the slightest hint in his teachings of his setting up the conduct of others as a standard for that of his disciples, —nothing to encourage or warrant them to do to others as others did to them. He placed them in a high position, and called them with a high calling; he taught them to rejoice under suffering in the cause of truth, to love their enemies, to lay up treasures in heaven. His words to them were, "If ye love me keep my commandments;" his commandment was that they should love one another. He gave them not only precept but example; he exhorted them to serve one another, and gave them an example of this by washing their feet. When they forsook him he did not forsake them but laid down his life for them, and when he rose again from the dead, without one word of complaint or reproach, he gathered them together again to teach them the things pertaining to his kingdom.

His apostles also exhort believers to walk worthy of the calling wherewith they are called,—to walk circumspectly, abstaining from every appearance of evil, and by their well doing put to silence the ignorance of ungodly men. Nor do they confine themselves to general exhortations or the statements of general principles; they point out the ways in which believers are to walk, warn them of the evils they are to avoid, and exhort them as to the courses they are to pursue. Their words as well as those of their divine master have been preserved for the edification and instruction of believers, and they are treated with practical contempt if they are neglected, whatever may be the reason or pretence. Let us look at some of the reasons or excuses given for neglecting them.

One is that it is our business to direct attention to principles, and if

these be true, correct practice will follow. We hesitate not to say that the statement is utterly false. We admit readily that there may be practice apparently most correct proceeding from false principles, but we also maintain that there may be true principles accompanied with gross ignorance of the practice becoming a Christian. We need go no farther than Holy Writ for sufficiently striking examples of this. But we also think it more likely, if such ignorance exists, that the principles are in reality in some way perverted, or that there are no real principles but only an ability to talk about them. Correct practice can only indicate the existence of true principles, and its absence will often enable us to detect the falsehood of a profession. Some excuse themselves for not inculcating practical subjects on their fellow men on the ground that they cannot communicate good practice, they can only impart principles. This is another gross fallacy; they can impart neither principles nor practice; they can only make statements, support them from Scripture and bring them under the attention of their fellow men; and they can do this just as much in regard to matters of conduct as of doctrine. God alone can bring their statements home with power to the hearts and consciences of those to whom they are addressed.

Another reason or excuse is, that to direct attention to matters of practice tends to produce Phariseeism; or in other words, to set up a standard of practice higher than that of the world around us, tends to produce in the minds of those who are induced to aim at or enabled in some degree to attain to it, a disposition to self-exaltation and spiritual pride. There can be no doubt that if this be done without a concurrent exposition of true principles, or as of greater importance than true principles, or along with the inculcation of false principles, such will be the result. But to say that the inculcation of Christian practice concurrently with Christian principle tends to produce Pharisaical sentiments, is only equivalent to asserting that the Scriptures have such a tendency, and that their teaching requires to be corrected and amended. Men who offer such reasons virtually declare themselves wiser than the author of Revelation. Some men fear that to declare the gospel in its simplicity, fulness, and freeness, may produce Antinomian sentiments and Sadducean practice, and accordingly they are careful to "guard the gospel," to tell their hearers that though the gospel proclaims God's mercy as absolutely free, yet there are conditions by which this mercy is to be obtained, or from which it may be ascertained that it has been attained. Others again fear, or profess to fear, that the inculcation of Scriptural precepts may produce conditionalizing views and Pharisaical feelings, and consequently keep them in the back ground, or mention them only in a depreciatory and guarded manner. And the effect of this is, that the former class fearing Sadduceeism produce Phariseeism; the latter, apprehensive of this, indirectly produce Sadduceeism. Both are too wise, and are "taken in their own craftiness."

Some carry the plea into practice, and pay no attention to Scriptural precept, on the ground (avowed or not) that any difference or superiority in conduct over others is counterbalanced by the sentiment of self righteousness it produces. Such a plea, if legitimately carried out, would lead to the superseding of the Word of God as the highest stand-

ard of conduct by the voice of the world, the public opinion of the particular time and place. To say that attention to, or the attainment of a standard of conduct higher than that of others necessarily produces sentiments of self-righteousness, is to make a statement entirely gratuitous and unsupported by the Scriptures, and is indeed equivalent to accusing their divine author of addressing man in an inconsistent and deceptive way, inculcating precepts, attention to which would be incompatible with, or in opposition to the principles imparted by the revelation of his character and procedure. Indeed those who make use of such a plea can scarcely be supposed to understand these principles; it is pretty evident, or at least fair to presume, that such effects as they anticipate would be those produced on themselves, namely that any superiority in their conduct would be accompanied by a corresponding degree of self-complacency; and that indeed their gospel must be that a Christ came into the world to tell men that they were destined to inherit eternal life. As such a gospel exhibits no love on the part of God to man (for the result it foretells may have been a matter of mere blind fate or necessity), so it cannot be expected to produce any love in return, or any care to manifest that love by keeping his commandments.

Another objection or excuse is that there is no absolute standard of right by which men can be directed, for that each man forms a standard for himself, which, though it may be founded on the Word of God, is yet modified by his natural constitution and the circumstances in which he may have been placed; that accordingly the differences in conduct between different individuals are only differences in degree, and that consequently it is useless to direct attention to any particular courses of conduct or points of practice, for no two men will take exactly the same view of them, and one may act more under the influence of Christian principle than another, even though his practical views may be inferior.

Now in the first place we have to reply to this that there is an absolute standard of right given long ago, and that is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and soul and strength and mind, and thy neighbour as thyself." We admit readily that this standard never has been attained but by one, and never will be attained by any mere human being; and we also admit, that, with all the guides supplied by Scriptural precept and recorded example, men's views will be modified by their respective characters and circumstances, that superior conduct is not a certain indication of superior principle, and that the differences amongst men are only differences in degree. We admit all this, but have yet to learn how it forms any good reason for neglecting the practical instructions of Scripture. If the attainment of a particular standard were a condition necessary to salvation, we could see great force in the objection, and should be inclined to relinquish all attempts at the attainment of such a standard in the sheer hopelessness of despair. But knowing that this is not the case,—that salvation is ours unconditionally and absolutely, we are no longer impelled or see reason to impel others by command with the accompanying threat of damnation for disobedience. We are now encouraged and have to encourage others by exhortation, to manifest in deed, not in word, love for him who first

loved us, by attention to the indications of the divine will given for our instruction in the Scriptures; and this we have the greater inducement to do, as it is the course most conducive to our own true happiness.

Further, admitting the truth of the statement in the objection respecting the varieties amongst men, we have to reply that if their characters vary they have one to contemplate whose goodness never varies, if their circumstances differ they have one to look to whose wisdom never fails. It is true that in their conduct men differ only in degree, but their differences will not be increased by having a higher standard than their own thoughts kept under their observation; and, differ as they may, their attainments will not be diminished by each of them having some higher object to aim at than his own devices. Such objections would be scouted were they given as reasons for neglecting to pay attention to the law of the land, the customs of society, or domestic relations, and why should they for a moment be breathed in reference to the indications of the will of God? In truth, those who make them manifest the atheism of their hearts: such guides for their conduct as are most conducive to their true welfare have been supplied by their heavenly Father; but they are utterly incredulous as to this, and prefer being guided by anything else, whenever the advantages to be derived from a different course of procedure are more obvious or immediately apparent.

Such and so groundless are the excuses for the neglect of the practical instructions of Scripture,—a neglect fraught with the most injurious consequences. The consideration of the proper course of procedure must be reserved for another article.

D. W.

ON THE FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE OF SCRIPTURE.

THE SABBATH.

Sabbath.—The ideal meaning of the root is to cease, leave off, or rest from work. It is not expressive of weariness, but of cessation from action. In another form of the root, it signifies to cease, to be abolished.

In Gen. ii. 2, 3, is the first mention of the Sabbath, under the name of the seventh day. In the seventh day, Aleim ceased from all his work, which he had created: and he blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he rested (ceased) from all the work which he had made. Be it observed that no command accompanied this first mention of the day of rest. *One* command, a simple command of prohibition, was delivered to our first parents in Eden. It seems not to have been consistent with the divine purposes to add any other. Again, there is a contradiction in itself, in all and every idea of what we call keeping the Sabbath, the Sabbath being only a cessation from work. Hence those who make it a day of works are profaning it, according to the real purport and intent of the original idea, which was the ceasing of the Divinity from those acts of creation which were carried on through the six days which had gone before: from which it appears, that the rightful keeping of the Sabbath must consist in a state of repose from all works, whether the institution be understood in a simple or a figurative sense.

This day, viz. the Sabbath, is in Scripture first called the seventh day; and as such is so connected with that number seven, that it would perhaps be impossible to comprehend what the one word denotes without understanding something of the other. But there is not a more difficult subject in the figurative language of Scripture, than that of numbers; and the signification of this number seven will demand our future consideration.

It is not left in doubt that the Sabbath is a sign of great importance (see Ezek. xx. 12—20), though one neither understood by the natural seed of Israel, to whom it was given in the natural sense, nor to the mere nominal family of the spiritual Israel, with whom this sign ought to bear a clear spiritual sense. Of what this appointment of the Sabbath is, the signification will presently appear. It must however be observed that the Sabbath was a sign of growing importance, until the period of its fulfilment arrived; its continuance being first of a day, one in seven days;—then of a year, one in seven years;—then one in seven times seven years;—next of seventy years, which took place during the captivity. See Lev. xxvi. 43. All these progressing figures being typical of that rest which followed upon the completion of that work appointed to himself by the Lord the Saviour, which needed to be accomplished for the salvation of mankind: a spiritual work, as much more excellent than the work of creation, as spirit is superior to matter. Hence, be it observed, that as none but a fool could believe it possible that any created being could add to the glory of the natural creation when it came out of the hands of God, so one would think he must be worse than a fool, who should conceive that by an effort of his own he could add even a shadow of merit to the perfection of the divine, spiritual work.

The Greek word is σαββατον, signifying *rest*, the sabbath day.

As a type or figure, the Sabbath under all its forms, whether of a day, a year, or seventy years, denotes *one* thing, viz. a rest from the labours and duties enforced by the law of works, as stated and enlarged upon, in a natural sense, in the fourth commandment, Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day, &c. Exod. xx. 8—11.

The apostle Paul, when addressing his own people, the Hebrews, and calling upon them, by every motive which might possibly affect a Hebrew, a child of Abraham according to the flesh, and a supposed believer in the testimony of Moses and the Prophets, to turn to and accept their Saviour, enlarges much upon this subject of the Sabbath, under the term, Rest. Compare Heb. iii. and iv. The apostle commences these chapters by shewing how much more worthy Christ is than Moses, and proving from thence how much greater their sin would be if they rejected Christ, than that of their forefathers who rejected Moses; shewing, from the example of those who tempted Moses in the Wilderness, and were therefore precluded from entering into that rest typified by the Promised Land, how much sorer the punishment of that present generation would be if they rejected Christ; it seeming, that during that period of the apostolic preaching, during that time in which thousands of the Jewish nation still lived who had seen, and it may be conversed with the Messiah, had seen the miracles he had performed, and the wonders attending his death, &c., there was such a call to believe and turn to the Lord as, it might seem, should have rendered it

impossible for even the mere natural man not to have obeyed. Hence the constant call of the apostles to the people, was to believe. Faith seeming to be so much in their power, that it is hardly to be conceived how any one amongst them possessed of common reasoning powers, could withold it; and it is therefore as understanding this state of the Jewish people, at that time, that St. Paul addressed them in this Epistle to the Hebrews, many parts of which are perplexing and alarming if considered as addressed to us, under the dispensation of the kingdom of God, into which no man can enter through his own efforts, or by any exercise whatever of his own mental powers.

But to return to the immediate subject of the Sabbath. In Heb. iv. St. Paul carries out the comparison, between the present generation, then addressed by him, and that of their forefathers in the wilderness, shewing how the rest which was before them, which was typified by the Land of Promise, (the Canaan of old), was by them to be obtained by faith—the want of faith being the point on which their forefathers had been lost—shewing, beyond all dispute, that the Sabbath or seventh day, as belonging to the earliest times of our creation, was the type of a future rest, which then remained for the people of God, Heb. iv. 9, the Greek for this word rest being σαββατισμος, by which word is denoted, not only a resting, but such a rest as God entered into when he had finished his work—a complete holy and happy rest—this rest, be it observed, being still future, although not far off indeed at the time the apostle addressed the Hebrews; whereby we are confirmed in what is said above, that the dispensation which then was, differed from that which was about to succeed in this particular, that there was a call on the people, at that period, to come in and be saved, a cry as from the Bridegroom, and such a cry as the human apprehension, it would seem, might take in: whereas, in the dispensation which was to come, the rest, σαββατισμος, then future, there is not, nor can be, any call to enter in; because the Lord of that dispensation knows that there is no power to do so, and that the privileges of his kingdom are altogether a free gift, the right to bestow which having been purchased by him, through his own perfect obedience, and the accomplishment in his own person of all the requirements of the law in the letter and in the spirit, can never be transferred. Thus says Ezekiel, speaking in the spirit and language of prophecy,—"It shall be the Prince's part to give burnt offerings, and meat offerings, and drink offerings, in the feasts, and in the new moons, and in the sabbaths, in all solemnities of the house of Israel:" &c. Ezek. xlv. 17, under which figures we are instructed, that every requirement of law was to be provided and supplied by the Lord the Saviour; leaving nothing for the children of his kingdom to add to its completeness. St. Paul admonishes the Hebrews, to labour to enter into that future rest, wherein there is a cessation of all labour, and whilst that dispensation lasted, which may properly be called that of the Apostolic church: a period of about forty years. It did appear that there was some power in man to obtain that rest by his own exertions, though assuredly there is none now to obtain that rest, by any effort of human energy; or to administer to another an entrance thereunto. As it behoved our Lord to fulfil all righteousness, he fulfilled the law of the Sabbath, by his rest in the grave during one complete day, after having finished the whole work of salvation for man; dis-

annulling the obligation of the formal keeping of the Sabbath, by the same act with which he fulfilled it; destroying the shadow and establishing the substance.

Those who, under the present dispensation, would revive the Jewish Sabbath, pretending that it is the same as the Lord's day, and saddling it with obligations, often of merely their own invention, prove themselves to be in the grossest darkness as to the true nature of that religion, of which they bear the name; and, if the Mosaic Law were not entirely dead, and, through the Divine mercy, past all power of injuring them, would draw down such weight of condemnation upon themselves as must crush them to the very dust. But the natural man can by no means be made to understand *that rest*, to which those who are made to be members of the kingdom of God, are at once admitted, in virtue of their membership. Unconditional Salvation is wholly and entirely beyond the grasp of his intellect; and thus, if withdrawn from his hold of one sort of condition, he only the more eagerly siezes upon another. Freedom of Salvation, and the perfect rest of the Sabbath, as it is found in the spiritual kingdom of our Lord, is, and ever must appear to him, as only having a carnal mind, totally unintelligible; on which account, the salvation of all men must ever remain a mystery to the natural apprehension. M. M. S.

THE DARK SIDE OF THE GOSPEL.

That the gospel has a *dark side* was asserted in our hearing, a few days ago, by a clergyman before a large congregation, in nearly the following words:—"It is our duty to be faithful: we dare not conceal from our auditory what the mistaken and canting benevolence of many in the present day would keep out of sight, and that is,—*the dark side of the gospel.*"

"It is our duty to be faithful." Doubtless, it is the duty of us all to be faithful; and he who takes upon himself to propound the gospel to his fellow creatures, is not faithful if he only give a one-sided view of it.

"The dark side of the *gospel*," however, appeared to us a very incongruous expression; and, on farther reflection, we venture to say that it looks very much like a contradiction in terms. Moreover, as the faithful minister who cautioned us against the unfaithfulness of the canting benevolence of many in the present day, said nothing by way of explaining the parodox—for such we must be permitted to call it—we confess that we are still in the dark as to the side of the gospel he referred to.

What has often amazed us in "faithful preachers," has been their silence (it would almost seem their studied silence) on the subject of the gospel itself. They will tell us of the hopelessness of our condition without it; they will describe it as a treasure of incalculable worth; they will commend it, with impassioned eloquence, to the consideration of their hearers; they will discourse of its wonderful adaptation to the exigencies of man's nature; they will depict, in glowing terms, the present and eternal blessedness connected with its reception; they will pourtray, with vehement pathos, and denounce as from the judgment-seat, the present condition of hopelessness, and the impending doom of those who reject it.—Yes, we have heard this *ad nauseam*, and are aware that a man who preaches after this fashion is called a *faithful* minister of the gospel: but from such preaching we are at a loss to discover what the gospel *is* after all. They have not told us; and, if a plain man were to be asked to deduce, from the popular preaching of the day, the meaning of the word "gospel," ignorant of its etymology and Scripture use, we venture to say that "*glad tidings*" would be about the last definition he would think of. We hear of the relations of the gospel to the divine purpose,—to the divine sovereignty, —to the divine government,—to human responsibility,—to human happiness, —to human destiny,—still the gospel *itself* is a phantom, and eludes our grasp.

O ye faithful preachers! for once bear with us while we are faithful with you. IF *you know the gospel, you know that it is glad tidings;*—that is, it is tidings which make you *glad:* if you are not glad you know not the gospel. Its essence is gladness, its fruit is gladness. It is gladness to its great originator, it is gladness among the multitude of the heavenly host, it is gladness in the heart of every one who believes it. If you are faithful you will preach this gospel, which fills you with joy, and inspires you with gladness; that which you have seen and heard, you will *declare.* Describe the various relations of the gospel, as they are discovered to us by inspired wisdom, by all means; but do not put the relations of the gospel in the place of the gospel itself. Tell your fellow creatures all that God has been pleased to reveal respecting moral government and human responsibility in reference to the gospel; but do not delude yourselves or your hearers with the idea that, when you have done this, you have been preaching the gospel. Listen once more to the angel,—"For behold I bring you glad tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people, for unto you is born...a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." This is the gospel. It is tidings—it is glad tidings of great joy—it is tidings of universal interest. To every sinner, therefore, if you would be faithful, say, "Unto *you* is born a Saviour,—unto *you* here are "glad tidings of great joy." And beware how you talk about "canting benevolence," lest you should be charging God with the same: for, if the denial that the gospel has a dark side be canting benevolence, then, as true as "God is light," in the gospel "there is no darkness at all;" for it comes from "the Father of lights," as does "every good and every perfect gift."

Yet are we compelled to confess, that there is "another gospel, which is not another," which has a fearfully dark side. It is the gospel of that modern divinity which converts the *gospel* into *law,* which drags man from under the comparatively mild law of Moses, whose *severest* penalty was visited upon the transgressor by the forfeiture of life; and inflicts upon those who fail to comply with its vague and extortionate requirements, a doom for which the adjudications of the bloodiest earthly tribunal have no parallel, and of whose torments the intensity and duration cannot be conceived.

And thus, the gospel, instead of being a revelation of the grace of God, becomes, in the hands of the modern preacher, a mysterious system of moral law; whence it follows, as a matter of course, that the gospel has its dark side. In this gospel, God is only seen as a magistrate, being "a terror to evil doers, and a praise to them that do well." Is it not marvellous, that this gospel passes current with so many, when it evidently places us under a more rigorous dispensation than any which preceded it? Do not its promoters tell us, that the dispensation of the Law has been superseded by the dispensation of Grace? They do; and yet they will tell us, that, while man is just as incompetent to please God now as he was then, that nevertheless the sanctions of the gospel are far more tremendous than were those of the legal dispensation of Moses. There was no threatening of endless woe to the despisers of Moses' law, but their gospel visits the rejection of *their** offer of mercy with an infliction which eternity will not exhaust, and which can only be sustained by a nature with which the offender is to be invested at the resurrection.

This is the dark side of the gospel! whence is projected a shadow over the broad vista of eternity, and even (blasphemy though it be, it is not ours), over the character of God himself. And who can penetrate the awful gloom? To man it is confessedly inconceivable. It baffles created mind. And yet, in all seriousness, we are told that this belongs to the gospel of the grace of God. The dark side of God's grace? Surely it were a libel upon the divine equity to call it the dark side of God's *justice!*

We may, however, be reminded that, notwithstanding the gospel emanates from the love of God, and that whilst it is conceded the word gospel means glad tidings, the words of him who commanded his apostles to proclaim it, did

* *Their* offer, we say, reader; for with God mercy is not an offer, but something far more consistent with the dignity of his gracious character.

it in these words, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned," and here we have the dark side of the gospel. We maintain, nevertheless, that the gospel as it is here stated, is as free from darkness as the nature of God himself. The gospel was to be preached,—the condition of those who heard it would be consequently affected by it: but neither that condition, nor the statement that that condition would be affected by it, constituted part of the gospel itself. The character and condition of the man who believed it was affected in one manner, the man who believed it not was affected in another.* And so of all the threatenings annexed to a rejection of the gospel: the threatenings are not constituent elements of the glad tidings. But in this, as in every other manifestation of the divine goodness, man cannot slight it with impunity. The particular sin of the Jews in reference to the gospel was *unbelief*; and its punishment involved that nation in calamities which are not yet exhausted, and whose effects will never be repaired. The sin of human nature is *unbelief*; and the gospel, as addressed to Gentiles, reveals its worthlessness, by eliciting that unbelief; and the justice of its condemnation to everlasting destruction is manifested, while the riches of divine grace are disclosed in those who believe, by the implantation of those principles which constitute the divine nature.

But it is not our design, in this paper, to treat of the effects of the gospel: our simple object is to defend it against those perversions of it which make it, to say the least, as much a bane as a boon.

The gospel *must be* good news. To preach the gospel is to preach Christ, who is "the brightness of the Father's glory." The gospel unveils "the face of Jesus," wherein we behold "the glory of God." The gospel itself has no dark side: neither all the darkness of human ignorance, nor the gross darkness of human guilt, reflects for a moment the shadow of a shade upon "the glorious gospel of the blessed God;" and, notwithstanding all the guilt, the condemnation, and the punishment consequent upon its rejection, it is still glad tidings, and shall be glad tidings to all people, for the provisions of the gospel are coextensive with human guilt, and coincident with all the spiritual exigencies of the race.

In the gospel every child of Adam has an interest,—or it would be grossly inconsistent to preach it to all: nay, if we did not know that all had an interest in it, would it be consistent to preach it to any? The fact of condemnation being the result of a rejection of it, implies an interest in it. Does God, in the gospel, tell me, that his Son died to save me, a guilty sinner? He does. I believe it; and am, in consequence, "filled with joy and peace." Does he say the same to my guilty fellow creature? He does: but he does not believe it. Nevertheless the gospel remains the same, and he who originated it changes not,—"yet he abideth faithful:" and my guilty fellow creature, though he suffer all the consequences of unbelief, shall not "make the faithfulness of God of none effect;" for he who "hath concluded all in unbelief," will, "in due time," "have mercy upon all. O the depth, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor? Or who hath first given to him and it shall be recompensed to him again? For of him, and through him, and to him are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen." See Rom. xi. Z.

THE LONDON THIEVES AND THE CITY MISSION.

The readers of the Universalist have, doubtless, seen a report of Mr. Walker's speech at Dundee, on the subject of his labours among the thieves of the Metropolis; and we should be glad, in reminding them of some of the facts he

* The nature of the results of the preaching of the gospel as described in this and other texts we cannot now discuss. We may remark, however, that "salvation" and "damnation" were immediate consequences, and not mere adjudications which would take place in another world. He that believeth *is passed* from death unto life, and he that believeth not *is* condemned *already*.

stated, to press upon their attention the illustration they afford of the great principle of Universalism, and the confirmation they supply of the arguments we are constantly using, and lastly, the parallel between the conduct of the respectable Christians mentioned by Mr. Walker with reference to himself and his labours, and the conduct of Christians generally with respect to the condition of those who are called the "finally impenitent."

1. The great principle of Universalism is that there are no hopeless cases. It is true that we *start* with it—that our argument is an *a priori* one—but we are not the less willing to have our position strengthened by induction. And, thank God, the world is full of facts which lead a thoughtful, candid, Christian mind to the same point—not the world of the natural philosopher only, nor of the mental, nor of the social philosopher—not the worlds of these alone; but the world of the Christian philosopher.

Now what is the conclusion to which every one reading the speech of Mr. Walker *must* come? Is it not that, among the outcast crowds of the socially damned there are hearts still human—bosoms that sigh, and eyes that weep? —infuriate prostitutes who will quietly listen while the Scriptures are read? Is it not that woman, dead to shame and lost to society, is alive to the voice which reminds her of her immortality? that men and women, hardened against law and reckless of its penalties, are full of sensibility when the gospel of love and good-will is brought home to them? that the hand which is raised against every man is extended in faith, and gratitude, and love to the true apostle of Christ? Is it not that there is a hell in this world—a hell of apparent hopelessness—of simple wickedness into which light and love never enter; and from which, all return to goodness of any kind is, popularly speaking impossible? and yet that even in this hell, when the gospel is lovingly preached it is discovered to be adapted—precisely adapted to the condition of its prisoners? not negatively alone, but positively adapted; so adapted as to draw them to Christ. Especially may we not conclude, that the reason men are not more generally brought to the truth—that the gospel is not more successful, is that it is not *apostolically* preached? This seems to be the great conclusion. And it leads to another, viz. that as man cannot come of himself, but must be sought out, and won, and drawn, this whole system is one instituted for this very purpose; and if this is the great design, that man *as man* may be brought to the knowledge of the truth, then somehow or sometime, when and how He who knows all things shall see best, the design shall be accomplished. And such cases as Mr. Walker states, clearly show that they are not to be trusted who affirm that man by a course of conduct makes himself for ever. For these thieves and outcasts who occupy so many hundreds of rooms in one district alone, are persons who have, by their conduct, banished themselves from ordinary society, herding together, a community of outlaws, all incorrigibly wicked, pests to society, living in defiance of laws, and enemies to all that is good, daily rendering their return to the ranks and duties of life more and more hopeless; who according to the principle just mentioned, *cannot* return: and yet, when the gospel of Jesus Christ is preached to them, they are found to have feeling and life; and to be, after all their hardening process, still capable of receiving it, and of being, by its wonderful power, transformed to something higher than the standard of human society, even to the image of God, the purity of the holy in heaven. And He who put it into the heart of this great man—we are half inclined to say *divine* man—to give himself to this holy labour of "gathering with" his master in "the highways and hedges," in "the dark places of the earth" (for what are darker?) and so reached them when their case was considered hopeless, He can reach man in the deepest extremity, and, unknown by man, subdue them to Himself. Nothing is impossible with Him.

2. We argue that the Scriptures abound with intimations and assertions of a great truth, now almost lost sight of, that Christ shall be so preached before "the end comes," as to draw all men unto Him literally. Now, how others may be affected by such a narrative as Mr. Walker's, we know not, but for ourselves we are bound to say that it irresistably strikes us as analogous to what takes

place in the case of those, who, by ordinary methods, have not been brought to a knowledge of the truth. In the depth of their condemnation—in the hell of their despair—away from the light which shines on the dwellings of God's covenanted people, with none but lost (to use the word popularly) beings about them, their great Father has not forgotten them, and the love of their Redeemer still follows them. Though dead to all other, they yet "know His voice," and with their grave clothes about them, they rise and follow Him.

3. Mr. Walker says that "he met with members of the Christian Church who looked upon any efforts made towards this class with the coldest indifference, and who even went the length of saying that it would be impossible that any movement for the better could be effected with these people," &c. This is exactly man's way of looking at these things; and no one will deny that Christians, generally, know little about faith. Of course, we are not speaking about the few, who in all ages exist, who never bow the knee to the Baal of their generation, but of Christians and Christian Churches in their popular aspect. And of these it must be said that they do not understand the doctrine of Christ; that they look always at "*the deserving*," "the worthy" people, and have neither compassion for (except in words, and on a Sunday) nor any regard whatever to the wicked—especially those who live apart from "society," and are sold to work wickedness. Such tales as Mr. Walker tells of these London wretches, and Dr. Browning of the convicts,* of their willingness to listen to the truth, and the readiness of many to receive it—such tales as these do one's heart good; they give brightness to the sun, and beauty to the flower, and light and joy to everything: for what matters it that everywhere in this "fair and beautiful and laughing world," there are charms for the eye, and music for the ear, and gladness for the heart, if man, its lord, must die? But when we find that sin, and consequent misery, cannot quite quench the light within him, nor bring him beneath their ruins, but that he rises from these the ashes of his funereal pyre, a bright, a holy, a happy, an immortal being; then the spirit revives within us, and from the drooping willows that weep o'er the rivers of this strange Babel land, we take, and tune our harps to sing again of mercy and goodness, for God, our own, our fathers' God, will not be always wroth, neither will he contend for ever, for the spirit would fail before him and the souls which He has made.

NOHDORN.

REVIEW.

Ireland, as I saw it: the Character, Condition, and Prospects of the People. By Wm. S. Balch. New York: Hallock and Lyon. London: H. K. Lewis, 1850.

Well do we remember the interest and delight with which, in the days of our boyhood, we perused the critique on Sir John Carr's Travels in Ireland, which appeared in the pages of the Edinburgh Review. Accustomed to make a run every summer through some country, continental or insular, or to suppose himself to have done so, the worthy knight was, it seems, in the habit of inflicting on the reading public of England, the result of his observations, in the shape of a quarto volume, which was published regularly each succeeding winter. On the occasion above referred to, his common-place book and Joe Miller, along with notes made while prosecuting his journey, had enabled him to draw up a very entertaining, albeit flimsy and superficial narrative. It is generally understood, that upon him and his book-making propensities, the doughty Scottish periodical, then "in its high and palmy state," and disporting itself in all the freshness of youthful vigour, was the means of putting an extinguisher.

Like Sir John Carr, our friend, Mr. Balch, paid a summer visit to Ireland, made a rapid run through its provinces,† and has given his remarks on the island and its inhabitants to the world. But unlike Sir John, he has, after having taken time to mature his thoughts, been content to record them in the form of

* See "The Convict Ship," published by Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

† His whole tour occupied less than a fortnight—from the 17th to the 29th of May, 1848.

a modest 8vo. (432 pp.); and, still farther unlike the author aforesaid, he has produced a work which is well worth reading.

The part of Ireland visited by Mr. Balch comprises portions of the Counties of Cork, Kerry, Limerick, Clare, Galway, Tipperary, King's, Kildare, Dublin, Louth, Armagh, Tyrone, Derry, and Antrim. He landed at Kinsale, and inspected Cork City, and Cove: he sailed up the Shannon to Limerick, devoted a day to the examination of the City and its institutions, proceeded thence by Lough Dearg to Shannon-Harbour, was a passenger by the Canal boat to Dublin, attended Mitchell's trial, saw Londonderry, and in quitting the country, was deeply impressed by a view of the Giant's Causeway, and the basaltic columns by which it is surmounted. He has forcibly described the Lakes of Killarney, and the surrounding scenery. With restless activity, with keen discrimination, with enlightened intelligence, he visited, surveyed and has reported on every person and thing that came within his reach. Our own visits to Ireland, especially a tour of the island made by us in 1844, when we went over at least one half of the ground trodden by our author, enable us—always keeping in mind the changes effected in the interim, by the failure of the potatoe crop, and the starvation, disease, death, pauperism and emigration to which that calamity has given birth—to bear our humble testimony to the extreme truthfulness and accuracy of our author's statements, wherever mere description is concerned.

Mr. Balch, we may inform our readers, belongs to the religious persuasion of Universalists in America, and ranks, as he deserves to do, among its leading and influential members. He is at present located in the City of New York, where he is pastor of the Bleeker Street Church, one of four buildings* possessed by the Universalist body, in that great and flourishing commercial emporium. Besides, he officiates as one of the editors of the *Christian Ambassador*, a talented hebdomadal devoted to the furtherance of the views of his sect. Born and bred in the small but interesting state of Rhode-Island†—a state settled originally as a colony by Roger Williams, distinguished for its respect for the rights of private judgment, and strict adherence to the principles and practice of religious toleration, at a time when toleration in most of the adjoining colonies was unknown, and possessing from Charles II. a charter so liberal, that, until the affair of Dorr about ten years ago, even republicans found its provisions amply sufficient for the administration of their government—our author, whose parents were at one time Baptists, seems early to have imbibed a strong love of liberty, combined with a strong desire to visit foreign parts. So strong indeed, judging from his own account, does this latter feeling appear to have been, that he may almost be regarded as having realized in his own experience, the hankerings after a roving life so forcibly depicted in Defoe's Robinson Crusoe. His description of the sensations with which, when young, he gazed on "the lofty peaks of the Moose-hillock, Sunnapee, Kearsarge, and Monadnock,‡ as towers upon pictured ramparts," and of those which were aroused when "he caught indistinct glimpses of the deep valley of the Wantastiquet, and the main ridge of the Green Mountains, stretching to the north and south, farther than the eye could reach" are absolutely and intensely poetical. Age, to be sure, served to correct this romantic and wandering tendency, by bringing along with it serious occupations. Many years since, Mr. Balch entered on the work of the ministry among the American Universalists, and betook himself sedulously and conscientiously to the discharge of his onerous duties. But his desire to gaze on the Old World had never, it appears, been extinguished. It continued to burn with a subdued, but deep-seated and steady flame in his bosom. At last, in the early part of the eventful year, 1848, he had an opportunity of gratifying it. Landing on the shores of Ireland, he thence proceeded by Scotland and England to the continent of Europe, where he visited France, Germany, and Italy. Circumstances, among others the perusal of a beautiful

* These are Bleeker Street, Orchard Street, Murray Street, and Fourth Street Churches; not to speak of the Churches in Brooklyn and Williamsburgh, two of the populous suburbs of New York, and both situated on Long Island.

† The birth-place of Channing.

‡ So quaintly and yet sweetly sung by our author's compatriot, Ralph Waldo Emerson

and affecting tribute to the memory of a beloved brother which happened to fall into our hands, had led, some years before, to a correspondence between himself and us. It was not, however, until after having completed his brief tour in Ireland, the account of which forms the subject matter of the volume before us, that, accompanied by Mr. Frederick C. Havemeyer, one of the most amiable and gentleman-like Americans with whom it has been our fortune to meet, and to whom most appropriately the work is dedicated, he afforded us the pleasure of grasping his friendly hand, and making his personal acquaintance.

We have no difficulty in delineating Mr. Balch's character intellectually and morally considered. In both respects, he stands exceedingly high. Besides possessing those qualities of activity, shrewdness and general intelligence—that ever restless and insatiable curiosity, which seems to regard the world itself as affording by far too limited a scope for observation and enquiry—qualities which he shares in common with all his countrymen—our author is distinguished by mental traits peculiarly his own. He is endowed with masculine strength of intellect. His views of persons and things are broad, liberal and comprehensive. To no small share of the poetical temperament, he unites a constant eye to the practical—an irrepressible tendency to look at matters, in a Utilitarian point of view. His writings are characterised by transparent luminousness of thought and expression; and exhibit frequently more than traces of a humour rich if not original, and kindly in its dealings with the oddities of mankind. The versatility of his powers cannot fail to command attention. No subject seems to come amiss to him. He can grapple, and that successfully too, with any thing and every thing. Throughout his conversation, correspondence and works, there are apparent great independence and decision of character. Sycophancy of all kinds he abhors. Amiable, affectionate, generous, is he in a high degree withal. His talents are unquestionably of a high order. But it strikes us that he has never yet put them to their mettle. His style he might with due care improve. Never elaborate, and by no means formed on the purest models, it is always vigorous, always idiomatic, always impressive. He writes good sturdy Saxon English. Occasionally, but rarely, do we find his volume besprinkled with such words as *happify*, *loafing* and other Americanisms. With a little more attention bestowed on the structure of his sentences, and a little more frequent use of the file, Mr. Balch, we conceive, might produce works deserving to take a permanent place in the literature of his country.

Widely different are the feelings with which we approach the consideration of the religious sentiments of our author, which may, in almost all respects, be regarded as those of the body with which he is associated. Here we do experience considerable difficulty in expressing ourselves. And this, merely from a strong disinclination, even where it may seem to be deserved, to utter the language of censure. We do not wish to speak severely. To advert to the subject of the Universalism of the United States at all in this article, is a task which, had a sense of duty permitted, we should most gladly have dispensed with. But the nature and contents of Mr. Balch's book, the high position which as a Universalist he occupies, and the object of our own periodical, all conspire to forbid reserve or delicacy in the matter. It is the truth of God, not human opinion, which is here concerned. To our author and his friends, our views concerning the extent of God's love, and the mode of its manifestation, appear doubtlessly to be narrow and bigotted. Antiquated, perhaps. Saturated, and even super-saturated, with what to them are the hateful doctrines of Calvin. He and they fancy themselves to have been enfranchised from prejudices and follies, under the debasing thraldom of which they conceive us still to labour. Not that Mr. Balch personally would express his dissent from us, after an offensive fashion. He is too amiable and too considerate to do so. But he thinks and says, that he and his friends have been making progress, while we are stationary, if not even retrograde in our sentiments. Be it so. We have every disposition to admit our author's progress. To deny the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, the necessity and efficacy of his atoning sacrifice, and the regeneration and new-creation of the minds of believers through the manifestation

and influence of the truth, by resolving the whole into a mere process of moral amendment, are certainly steps onward. But in what direction? To pure and perfect truth, declare our American friends. In our apprehension, on the contrary, by the adoption and propagation on their part of views, some of them forming a portion of the creed of Pelagius, and others characteristic of the more modern systems of Socinianism and Arminianism, they have descended and are continuing to descend into the regions of the most unscriptural and deadliest errors. Substitution of human and personal merit, for that divine righteousness which was finished on Calvary, and clothed with which alone any guilty creature can appear accepted before God: removal of sin, by something else, and something short of the self-sacrifice of Jesus Christ; and vague notions of a resurrection by divine power alone, made to supersede the revealed fact of our rising again to newness of life as one with Christ, as having had our Adamic nature ended and our sins washed away by the shedding of his precious blood, and as being new-created and invested with the divine nature through the power of his resurrection; appear to us as among the worst, the most pestilent and the most infidel forms, in which the religion of flesh can be asserted and inculcated. There is progression obvious in all this unquestionably. But it is not like advancement in the knowledge and love of the truth of God, infinite like God himself. On the contrary, its boundary is very visible. Mr. Newman, (F. W.) has shewn what it is.* It is the ultimate abnegation of all revealed truth, and ultimate acquiescence in the most unqualified and thorough-paced scepticism. Already in the case of many of the professed Universalists of the United States, have no equivocal symptoms of this issue made their appearance. Witness the recent controversy among them respecting Scripture miracles and animal magnetism. Universalists we are, and Universalism rightly understood we love, because God in his Word hath seen meet to proclaim the ultimate and complete destruction of sin and death, through the death and resurrection of his own well-beloved Son; John i. 29; 1 Cor. xv. 22—28, 54; 1 Tim. ii. 4, 6, iv. 10; Heb. ii. 14, ix. 26; 1 John iii. 8; Rev. xxi. 5; but a Universalism which assumes human reason in any respect, and not divine revelation in all respects, as its basis—still more, a Universalism which cannot be satisfied except by the offering up of whole hecatombs of revealed divine truths, upon the altar of the unsanctified human intellect—however much it may boast of its progress, may feel pride in following humbly at a distance the triumphal march of human science and human civilization, and may be profuse in its taunts of those to whom a *Thus saith the Lord* carries with it infinitely more weight, than any mere human reasonings, even the most subtile and plausible, is nevertheless in the estimation of all who have been taught by the Scriptures themselves, and whose progress in divine knowledge is Scriptural, just like any other form of religion which deems it essential to progress to sacrifice the truth of God, *pro tanto* a species and system of infidelity.

Progression in divine knowledge we contend for as strenuously as Mr. Balch and his friends can do. Years since, we tried to draw attention to the fact that to set bounds to the meaning of the Scriptures, by the adoption of fixed human creeds confessions and articles, as it is the very spirit and essence of Popery, so has it been the bane and grave of Protestantism. We shewed it to be presumptuous and insulting to the Holy One of Israel, to attempt to limit His infinite power of self-manifestation, by any discoveries concerning his character, real or pretended, which had been made already by the paltry, shallow, erring mind of man.† But we never dreamed of confounding progress in the knowledge of the truth of God, with progress in human reasonings and human inferences concerning it. In the one case, God himself is the teacher, by continued opening up of the meaning of that word which originally he saw meet to indite, by shedding more and more light upon his own sacred and infallible

* In his "Soul: its Sorrows and Aspirations;" and his "Phases of Faith."
† See "Why is Popery Progressing?" 1835.

oracles; in the other case, man making his own mind, reasonings, and scientific attainments the standard of truth, and of what God should reveal, progresses by dragging down the meaning of Scripture statements, and Scripture discoveries, more and more to his own level. Our American friends may glory in this latter kind of progress if they please. They may pity us, as being content to stand still, and to see, not only the foremost minds of the age, but even inferior capacities sweep by us, in the pursuit and acquisition of rational and soul-satisfying knowledge. We certainly are content to shun their example. We certainly desire to profit by the warning which they unconsciously afford, of the dangers attendant on the subjection of the divine to the human—the testimony of God to the downward tendencies of the mind of man. But are we, on this account, the enemies of religious progression? God forbid. To stand still in Christian knowledge and love, is really to go back, as witness the melancholy state of Protestant Churches and Protestant individuals at the present day. Growth in *the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ*, as that which alone is connected with and productive of *growth in grace*, 2 Pet. iii. 18, is the object of our fondest and most intense aspirations. From divine truth known, we desire to be led on to divine truth yet unknown. Not supposing ourselves *to have already attained, or to be already perfect*, we desire *to forget things which are behind, and to press on to those things which are before*. Phil. iii. 12, 13. Rather, we desire as *scribes who are instructed unto the kingdom of heaven*, to be *like householders, bringing forth out of our treasures, things new as well as old*. Mat. xiii. 52. But not to our own reason, or our own will, do we look for this. Not by casting away precious truths of God, and drinking in the most deadly errors of scepticism and infidelity, do we hope to achieve this. Not by attempting to be *as Gods*, and thus copying the original transgression of our common progenitor, do we choose to risque that repulse which equitably and inevitably waits on every instance of human presumption. Luke xviii. 14. Our befitting attitude as creatures is not, either in knowledge or anything else, to attempt to rise to God, but to be kept recollecting our entire and unqualified dependence on his condescending to come down to us. Through Scripture alone, opened up increasingly as to its meaning to the mind believing it and thereby subdued by its truth, can increase of divine knowledge be communicated; and this divine knowledge, proceeding solely as it does from him *who is the father of lights, from whom cometh down every good and every perfect gift*, James i. 18, also 5, 6, is as dependent for its increase upon his sovereign will, as it is for the first and lowest degree of its manifestation. Ephes. i. 17—23, iii. 17—19. It is in no case *of him that willeth, or of him that runneth*, but in all cases *of God that sheweth mercy*, Rom. ix. 16, that advance in the knowledge of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ, can by any possibility take place. Dear old Robinson, in the discourse which he delivered to the Pilgrim Fathers, on the eve of their departure on that voyage* which was to lay the foundation of the mightiest Republic which the world has ever seen, clearly and admirably thus expresses our own sentiments with reference to this matter:—"I am verily persuaded, the Lord has yet more truth to break forth out of his holy word. For my part I cannot sufficiently bewail the condition of the *reformed Churches*,† who are come to a period in religion, and will go at present no farther, than the instruments of their reformation. The Lutherans cannot be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw; whatever part of his will our God has revealed to Calvin, they will rather die than embrace it: and the Calvinists, you see, stick fast where they were left by that great man of God, who yet saw not all things. This is a misery much to be lamented; for though they were burning and shining lights in their times, yet they penetrated not into *the whole counsel of God*, but were they now living, would be as willing to embrace FARTHER LIGHT, as that which they first received. I beseech you to remember, it is an article of our Church Covenants, THAT YE BE READY TO RECEIVE whatever TRUTH shall be made known to you,

* By the Mayflower. † This was written in 1620.

FROM THE WRITTEN WORD OF GOD. Remember that and every other article of your sacred Covenant. *But I must here withal exhort you, to take heed what ye receive as truth: examine it, consider it, and compare it with* OTHER SCRIPTURES OF TRUTH, *before you receive it; for it is not possible that the Christian world should come so lately out of such thick antichristian darkness, and that* PERFECTION OF KNOWLEDGE *should* BREAK FORTH *at* ONCE." Progress in the knowledge of God's truth, by increased teaching on the part of God, through his word,—not progress in human reasonings concerning that word, leading to the abandonment of its fundamental doctrines and principles,—as it was Robinson's view of what is desirable and profitable, and where God wills is realized, in the case of those who know the gospel, so is it ours.

Passing over other matters, some of them of no small importance, in which regard to the Scriptures of truth compels us to differ from Mr. Balch and his associates, we may advert to two features of American Universalism which we deem it incumbent on us at the present time to expose. These are,

First, the undue importance which seems to us to be attached by our American friends, to the preaching and inculcating of the doctrine of Universal Salvation. Certainly the fact of God's unlimited love occupies a prominent place in the Holy Scriptures. A most prominent one. But it is not set down there to the exclusion of others. It does not exhaust *the whole counsel of God.* However valuable, it constitutes merely one out of a large and indefinite series of truths, revealed by Him who alone is competent to *teach savingly and to profit.* Kept in its own place, it is important; nay, absolutely indispensable to the perfection of the heavenly system. But when made to supersede or take the place of other doctrines, it becomes productive of confusion; and, marring the beauty and symmetry of the plan of salvation, imparts to the whole an irregular and distorted appearance. By Him who knoweth the end from the beginning, the ultimate *making of all things new*, Rev. xxi. 5, was, in subserviency to his own glory, contemplated as the grand issue of Providence and Grace; but it was an issue, end or object to be attained, through the previous employment of a long, diversified and complicated* series of means. It is ignorance or forgetfulness of this fact, on the part of our American friends, that we complain of. With them, Universalism, such as they have imagined it to be, is every thing. It is the almost exclusive burden of every sermon and every tract. It is the panacea for every ill. It is not only to benefit mankind as a whole hereafter, but even here, its general reception is to regenerate society, and convert this sin and bloodstained earth, into a second and blooming paradise. This is not less unscriptural than it is absurd. Indeed, it is most melancholy. It actually throws over truth the aspect of falsehood; and adds unnecessarily one to the grounds of dislike to a discovery of God's Word, already, for a variety of other reasons, disliked enough. Universal Salvation, rightly understood and occupying its proper place, supplies the explanation, as it constitutes the goal of God's procedure towards man. It enables us to comprehend, why man was created fleshly, although innocent; why law in paradise was prescribed; why sin and death entered; why the Mosaic dispensation was temporarily set up; why the Messiah, *the Lord from heaven*, made his appearance in flesh; and why, through his death and resurrection, there is not a recurrence to the old fleshly system which he ended and superseded, but the introduction and establishment of a spiritual and heavenly system which is to last for evermore. And this, by shewing and satisfying us, that the plan or scheme revealed in Scripture is one, the object of which is "to glorify God's" wisdom, power, love and other attributes, as having overruled sin and death, obstacles apparently insurmountable, and apparently destructive of the possibility of good to man, to be the very means of enabling Him, through the divine righteousness and life introduced by His own Son, to supersede human nature by the divine nature, and thereby to give man, as made new in Christ and as *bearing the image*

* The word πολυποικιλος, used Ephes. iii. 10, deserves consideration.

of the heavenly, "to enjoy Him for ever."* Thus apprehended and disposed of, Universal Salvation or the ending of sin and death, and the rendering of human beings divinely righteous and alive in Christ Jesus, gives a death-blow equally to Socinianism, in all its various forms, which would disparage the evil of sin, by denying the only divine and adequate cause of its removal, the blood of atonement; and to Manicheeism, by whomsoever and in whatever way adopted and supported, when it would ascribe to sin, by ascribing to the torments of sinners, everlasting, that is, infinite or divine existence. Hence it appears, that the grand use of Universalism, is that of a key to unlock the whole treasure-house of heavenly mysteries. Viewed in this light, and treated after this fashion, we keep it in its proper place, and the divine blessing upon it may be invoked and confidently anticipated. Otherwise made use of, the doctrine is offensive. It is worse. It subverts the truth of God altogether. As a substitute for the gospel and for gospel influence, it becomes absolutely pernicious. For it substitutes God's end, for the blood and resurrection of Christ, the only means by which that end is reached and accomplished; and merging the personal in the universal, it counteracts, as far as human blundering can do so, the operation and efficacy of those private and individual manifestations of the truth to the conscience, by which alone any become new creatures, and have purity and heavenliness of heart and life promoted in them.—Would that our American friends but understood and acted on this.

Secondly, almost as a corollary from what we have just said, we object to the system of God's universal love being taught to the world at all. Imitating the manner in which God himself proposes and enforces it, which is as it were in the language of whisper and suggestion, and with a certain degree of reserve, while we should not shun to declare and avow our belief in it on all proper occasions, we should be cautious about obtruding it on the notice, and parading it before the eyes of unregenerate men. Not that we are to adopt Dr.T. Burnet's practice of locking up our convictions on the subject in a dead language. And not that any thing like equivocation or falsehood is to be had recourse to by us. Truth in regard to this, as well as every other point of revealed doctrine, is openly and steadfastly, when requisite, to be avowed and maintained. But *pearls*, our Lord himself being witness, are not carelessly and indiscriminately to be *cast before swine*. Mat. vii. 6.† Scripture doctrines, as they cannot be understood, so are they all liable to be abused by the carnal mind of man. And the higher the rank in the scale of truth which such doctrines hold—the more profound and comprehensive the views which they involve—the greater is their liability to abuse. Divine truth stands ever opposed to fleshly reason and fleshly notions of truth. Only as rendered divine by the truth of God itself, or as seeing God's truth in the light in which He himself sees and presents it, is the mind of any man conscious of its own shallow and fallible reason having been superseded by the substantial and infallible reason of God. Until this, by the illuminating power of God himself,‡ takes place, in vain is revealed truth presented objectively to any one. He may look at it. He may even investigate it, and form his own conceptions regarding it. But he does so, merely after a fleshly fashion. Left to himself, he neither has nor can have any right understanding of its meaning. Its real and spiritual import is either by him openly rejected; or, if avowedly received, it is so, not according to its own nature, but according to the nature of the mind looking at it. Admirably correct, in this respect, is the old axiom of the schoolmen: *omnia secundum naturam recipientis, recipiuntur*. This may serve to explain our objection to making God's universal love a common topic of conversation with worldly men, or even to formally addressing them on the subject. The gospel itself, which is not a proclamation of God's unlimited love to man, but glad tidings addressed to individuals,§ and

* See the answer to the first question of the Westminster Assembly's Shorter Catechism.

† Witness, besides, His own procedure, as recorded, Mat. xiii. 1—17, and xvi. 1—4.—Also, xxvi. 63, and xxvii. 12; and John xix. 9. Compare the passages last alluded to, with Isai. liii. 7.

‡ 2 Cor. iv. 6.

§ *Who hath ears to hear, let* HIM *hear*. Mat. xiii. 9.—See likewise Rev. xiii. 9.

which never operates except through its being personally and individually received,* is liable to abuse. To the world, even in the lowest and most diluted form in which it can be presented, salvation by grace must ever appear a licentious doctrine. *Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?* Rom. vi. 1, is an objection in the form of a query, which has neither sense nor point, except on the supposition of the fleshly mind of man being constrained on mere fleshly principles to regard the gospel, as, by setting believers free from law and from the consequences of law transgressed, leading necessarily to laxity of conduct. And that the gospel has actually been abused to licentious purposes, not only by hypocritical or deluded professors of it, but even by believers of the truth themselves when exposed to temptation and left to the operation and tendencies of their own carnal nature, we have more than one inspired apostle for our authority. See James, Peter, and Jude; besides the epistles of Paul and John.† But if so, with reference to the preaching of Christ's perfect work, as ensuring the salvation of the individual, how much greater would be the risque of immorality and licentiousness, were we to preach generally and indiscriminately the work of Christ as issuing in the salvation of the whole human race! Alas! if abuse attend the one, how much greater the abuse likely to result from the other! In the case of members of the Church, love, that heavenly principle which, so far as it supersedes law, restrains from evil, Rom. xiii. 10, and leads to *the crucifixion of the flesh with the affections and lusts*, Gal. v. 24, also constrains those in whom it dwells, in proportion to its strength, *to live not unto themselves, but unto him who died for them and rose again*, 2 Cor. v. 15; but in the case of a mere worldly and unregenerate man, how awful the danger, by proclaiming to him a truth which it is absolutely impossible for him to understand, and which he is still less able to apply, of his being set free from the operation of the only principles of restraint, low and slavish as they are, which he is capable of feeling!—But the remedy? To disguise truth; or to proclaim error in its stead? To do so is the world's cure, and has been but too often had recourse to, not only by men of mere fleshly minds under the bondage of law, but even by weak and misjudging Christians. Hence the abominable and anti-scriptural systems of Pelagius and Arminius. Hence the various modifications of these. Hence modern and moderate Calvinism. All systems, in which, with a view to guard and promote the supposed interests of holiness, man's righteousness is, in the teeth of God's declarations to the contrary,‡ made in one way or another to be essential to salvation, and a ground of the sinner's hope towards God. In which, by means of man's lie, an attempt is sought to be made to obviate the supposed injurious effects upon the mind, of God's pure and naked truth. Awful, and most revolting to a believer of the gospel is such tampering with the word and truth of God. No wonder that when the Scriptural gospel of free grace, abounding through the divine righteousness of Christ alone, has been thus dealt with—that when man has thus assumed to be wiser than God, and to correct His heavenly method of making Himself known—professors of religion should have reason to complain of the exceedingly trifling results produced by what *they call* the preaching of Christ crucified. The true remedies for all this are in the light of God's own Word most obvious. Let the gospel be the first and only thing proclaimed and spoken of to ungodly men. And to them let it be proclaimed in purity, be the consequences what they may. Let Christ's work alone, without any addition or admixture—without the suggestion of any condition whatever as remaining to be fulfilled by the creature—be the object proposed to their attention. God's

* *But he that received seed into the good ground, is he that heareth the word, and understandeth it; which also beareth fruit, and bringeth forth, some an hundred fold, some sixty, some thirty.* Mat. xiii. 23. Take along with this, Heb. iv. 2, and xi. 6.

† Most salutary as a warning to believers, is 1 Cor. x. 1—12; and as a counteraction to all suggestions of their own wicked hearts, that they should throw the blame of their transgressions upon God, is James i. 13—15.

‡ *Christ is the end of the law for righteousness, to every one that believeth.* Rom. x. 4.—Read also, iii. 20—28, v. 21 vi. 25; Titus iii. 5, 7. 1 John. v 11.

righteousness, their righteousness; God's life, their life. Sin freely, fully, and everlastingly forgiven, through the shedding of Christ's precious blood. This is God's gospel. These are God's glad tidings to guilty man. Then, with men rejecting the gospel, let all discourse on topics which only, in the light of the gospel believed, can be understood and apprehended, be respectfully but firmly declined. Let there be no discussion of sovereignty, the origin of evil, or election—let there be no discussion of God's universal love—with such parties. To neglect this precaution, is to *give that which is holy, unto dogs*; Mat. vii. 6; and to risque opening the floodgates of immorality and crime. But in the case of believers of the truth, as occasion offers or necessity requires, let every Scriptural doctrine, and that of Universal Salvation among the rest, be set before them. Let the Phariseeism* and Saduceeism† which dwell, and are but too apt to manifest themselves even in the *children of faith*, be thus, as well as by every method prescribed in Scripture, assailed. Let God's own remedy for the opposing and correcting of the tendencies of fleshly mind, be thus increasingly had recourse to and applied. That is, not the dilution of God's truth with falsehood, under the pretence or mistaken idea of guarding that truth from abuse, a mode of dealing with the subject which ever leads to evil in practice; but the bringing of more enlarged views of divine truth to bear upon the heart and conscience. Increase of knowledge of God and of God's way of salvation, and thereby increase of that principle of *faith which worketh by love*, is God's mode of increasingly *separating* the members of His church from the world, and of causing them *to abound in every good word and work*. Are we understood? If so, our American friends will have a clue to the utter dislike and repugnance wherewith, even although most determined Universalists ourselves, we regard every attempt to enlist the world on our side, and to swell our ranks by the adhesion of ungodly, unregenerate and infidel men. *Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way that leadeth to eternal life.* Mat. vii. 14. Universal Salvation, or that unboundedness of new-creation in which the work of the one man, Christ Jesus, and *the resurrection of the just* through him terminates; the broad vista, which opens up to us, after having been by grace led into the narrow way that is everlasting; is one of the highest, most comprehensive and naturally most inconceivable doctrines of God's word, requiring, in order to its due apprehension, an eye enlightened and a heart purified by faith. To members of the Church of God, and to them alone, therefore, as having had the truth of God concerning their own salvation in Christ Jesus,—the doctrine the most above, and the most repulsive to the fleshly mind of man, and the doctrine which has ever been found to be a stumbling block to all, except the few who constitute the election of God—carried home personally to their consciences by the Holy Spirit, let it be confined.

D. T.

(To be concluded in our next.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

[We have received the two following communications in reply to the query proposed by *Amor Veritatis*, in p. 212, of our last Number, which we insert, leaving the arguments employed by their writers to the candid consideration of our readers.]

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

Dear Sir.—I am happy to be able to reply to your correspondent, *Amor Veritatis*, with perfect satisfaction to my own mind, and in accordance with the sentiments of a numerous, though comparatively small body of Christians, usually denominated Strict

---

* The stand by, I am holier than thou principle. See Luke xviii. 9—14.

† The subjection of divine revelation to human reason principle. See Mat. xxii. 23—33.

Baptists. They do, indeed, in the exercise of true Christian charity, both in "*the pulpit*" and the *prayer-meeting*, in public and in private, recognize every believer in Christ Jesus, as a brother; but in Church fellowship they refuse to admit those whom they believe to be walking disorderly in rejecting one of the ordinances of the Church of Christ.

That the subject of Baptism has been "a bitter question" is not the fault of the subject; the bitterness being not in baptism, but in the unsanctified minds of disputants. Every question connected with him whose kingdom is not of this world, has been transmuted into "a bitter question," and among others, the doctrine and the mode of baptism. Your correspondent, however, would not, from that fact, pronounce the other "bitter questions" as "never to be settled:" and if he, who proposes "questions for profitable reflection with calm dispassionate Christians," will only investigate the invariable Scriptural meaning of the word translated "baptize," the invariable Scriptural references to the mode of baptism, such as "buried with him by baptism into death," &c., and the invariable practice of the inspired apostles, in demanding profession of faith previous to baptism, and baptism previous to Church fellowship, a man of his apparent candour will not long consider it a "never to be settled question," so far as his own conscience and practice are concerned.

I, for one, feel thankful to you and to your correspondent, for bringing this important question "to the law and to the testimony,"—important at all times as an institution of Christ, but now surrounded by many interesting circumstances in consequence of the peculiarities of the present day. If neither precept nor example can be found in the Scriptures for the ordinance of baptism, the Baptists and Pædobaptists may shake hands for ever, for they have been disputing about a nullity: if, however, the Book of God has clearly revealed the ordinance, and indicated its mode and subjects, then the words of the Book of Common Prayer, or of any other book, are of no more authority to the believer than the braying of an ass. If we have not a "thus saith the Lord" for every doctrine and practice, let us not only repudiate the doctrine and the practice as speedily and as publicly as we can; but, let us also, not sanction error in the doctrine or the practice of God's dear children, by having fellowship with their error. Let us, with all humility, but with all firmness, manifest our allegiance and fidelity to our Master, and our brotherly love to his subjects, by bearing our testimony against it.

Your correspondent asks, "Where is the proof that they (the holy writers of the Scriptures), transferred their commission to any Gentile: and who was the first Gentile that can be produced in the New Testament, that baptized either Jew or Gentile?" Now what was the commission of the apostles? "Going, therefore, disciple all the Gentiles, baptizing them (*αὐτους*—the disciples,) into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Here, then, is their commission: first, to make disciples from amongst the Gentiles; secondly, to baptize the Gentile disciples; and, thirdly, to transfer their commission, by teaching their disciples to observe *all things whatsoever* he had commanded his apostles. Now it is precisely because the apostles were "inspired," —"men of God," and "all held their authority by the divine commission from God direct," that we are bound to conclude, without the shadow of a doubt, that they fulfilled their commission in letter and in spirit,—teaching the disciples, by precept as well as by practice, to observe all things whatsoever the Lord had commanded to his apostles. And even this is not left to conjecture, for in his epistle to the Philippians (iv. 9), Paul says, *those things which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me, do.* And again, in his second epistle to Timothy, (ii. 2), *And the things which thou hast heard of* (or by) *me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also.*

Whether the second question of your correspondent admits of direct answer, I know not. The inspired history may not have on record "who was the first Gentile that baptized either Jew or Gentile;" and I collect from the tone of your correspondent's letter, that both he and I value ecclesiastical history at what it is worth; but that the Lord's commission extended to Gentiles is without question, because they are named in the very words of the commission (*τα ἐθνη*): that Gentiles were discipled and baptized, we have abundant examples; that the commission of the apostles commanded them to teach the Gentile disciples to observe all things whatsoever that Jesus had commanded them is beyond doubt, for it is contained in the words of the commission. And it is, thus, clear to my mind, that Gentile believers were baptized after they had become disciples, and that they were taught to baptize other disciples without reference to any previous distinction of Jew or Gentile, male or female, bond or free.

VERITAS AMORIS.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

Dear Sir,—In reply to the query of *Amor Veritatis*, let the following be admitted or rejected, as may seem good to the Scripture-taught reader.

The commission which all the holy prophets had from God, with one exception—the great prophet, Jesus of Nazareth, was neither transferred nor transferable. No other man or class of men had either part or lot in this matter. To those holy men, including the apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ, power was given to heal the sick, raise the dead, cast out devils, open the blind eyes and turn from darkness to light, and to do other wonderful works. To the apostles power was given to remit or retain sins, and that on whomsoever they laid their hands they should receive the Holy

Ghost. But none of them, the Lord Jesus excepted, had power or authority to transfer these gifts to others.

Let all those, therefore, in this day, who call themselves successors of the apostles, ambassadors of Christ, &c., show to us that they have power to perform the works that the apostles did, prove to us that they are *in Christ's stead*, that Jesus said to *them*, "he that heareth *you* heareth me;" "and lo! I am with you alway, to the end of the world" (age). Then, but not till then, may we believe that the gifts are transferred to them.

The writer of this cannot produce, from the New Testament, an instance of any one being baptised by a *Gentile*. It is possible that Timothy baptised; but, though there had been proof of this, Timothy was but *half* a *Gentile*. *Baptism* was no part of the burden laid upon the Gentiles. Acts xv. And none other burden was to be put upon them. Rev. ii. 24.

The commission given to the apostles, before the resurrection of Jesus, was not so full and extensive as that given them after he rose from the dead. At first, they were commanded to preach the gospel only *to the lost sheep of the house of Israel;* and it does not appear that either the twelve apostles or seventy disciples had received the Holy Ghost. But, soon after Jesus rose from the grave, he met with the eleven disciples, breathed on them, and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost,"—gave them power to remit and retain sins; and, because all power was given unto him in heaven and in earth, he said, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and lo, I am with you alway, unto the end of the age." Did the apostles execute their commission? They did. Before the end of the age referred to by Jesus Christ, the gospel was preached to *all nations, to every creature under heaven*. Matt. xxiv. 14. Col. i 23. But were all who believed baptized? In all probability they were. Though Paul was not sent to baptize, but to preach the gospel, and was thankful that he had baptised so few, yet all who believed may have been baptized by those who accompanied Paul; for what is called dispensing baptism, was never, by divine command or authority, confined to apostles, pastors, teachers, or any peculiar class of learned men, as the practice has long been amongst those who think good to continue water baptism. Thus it might be said that the apostle Paul baptized all who believed the gospel that he preached; for it is said that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, though Jesus baptized not, but his disciples. Paul, in becoming all things to all men, allowed the believing Jews to continue circumcision, while he knew that circumcision *availed nothing*. And though he baptised not himself, he might allow those that were with him to baptize all who believed.

I have, as well as others, my own opinion concerning the *mode;* but, considering that, since the consummation of the age, we are exclusively under the new covenant, (Heb. viii. 10—13), which, as being purely spiritual, knows nothing of externals, and in which accordingly all types are superseded by their antitypes, I pass over this question as superfluous.

The trueworshippers of the Father are not now required to worship him by cold and formal, carnal and beggerly elements, that can be touched, tasted, and handled; but, leaving all these, including both baptism and the supper, as having "vanished away" with the Old Covenant, let them now worship the Father in *spirit* and in *truth*. It does not appear from Scripture, that either baptism or the Lord's supper were intended to be observed after his second coming, which took place at the destruction of Jerusalem, and scattering of the House of Israel, when it was said, "*Now is come Salvation.*" The gospel is not, ye *may* be saved—ye shall be saved, through believing, &c.; the gospel of the grace of God is, ye *are* saved. All are reconciled to God by the death of his Son—all are saved by his life. None but those who were in Christ's stead had authority to say, Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.

Finally, those calling themselves ministers of Christ, in our day, and continuing to baptize in his name, to offer pardon or forgiveness, salvation or eternal life, upon any condition, however small, to be performed by man, whether in his own strength, or in that communicated to him by the Spirit of God, has no more Divine authority to do so than Simon the Sorcerer had to attempt conveying the Holy Ghost by the laying on of his hands. Many are the ministers who zealously persevere in what they erroneously conceive to be using means to save souls. Their great work is that of urging poor sinners to believe what they call the gospel, and to attend diligently to the observation of what they call ordinances of Christ; coaxing them with all the imaginary joys of heaven, to be theirs if they believe and obey; and threatening them with all the fabulous horrors of an eternal hell, if they reject the offers and neglect the means held out to them, which are nicknamed *means of grace*. Who hath required this at their hands? Not the God of Paul's fathers—He alone is the *user* of the means of salvation. The gospel of God's grace does not tell men what they are to do in order to save themselves; but is the joyful proclamation of what God hath done in saving every individual of a lost world.

ANETAZO.

THE UNIVERSALIST.

NOVEMBER, 1850.

JEREMIAH WHITE.

(*Concluded.*)

It was our intention to present the readers of the Universalist with a few selected extracts from the work before us; but we see on the cover of the present number an announcement that a republication of it is progressing; and as it is a work which we really wish every one we can influence to possess, and have written with the view of inducing them if possible to possess; it seems better to leave it entire, and to recommend it to their regard as a whole. It will doubtless be as cheap as in these days of cheapness is possible. We really do not know, reader, that it will from any other source than that which is accessible to all; for living at a distance we have not had the privilege of hearing or knowing more than "the public;" and can only conclude from what the publisher has already done that everything he can do will be done to make "cheap" the "good news" for a population which (none will deny) greatly needs such news, and which is suffering from the results —the natural and inevitable results—of distorting and corrupting the truth.

White's argument is *scriptural*. Like the divines of his time he is "mighty in the Scriptures." We should really be pleased to see what our opponents have to say to him, or rather, to his arguments; for we are not and never were afraid of reading any side. And we can assure those who care about it that this many-sided reading does not, nor ever did, leave us converts to the last book we got through. But we will tell them one of the effects of this "universal" reading—it has convinced us that no side has got a monopoly of truth, or of learning, or of cogent reasoning. Perhaps it has damaged our orthodoxy a little, for sometimes we could not resist the conclusion that orthodoxy had the worst of it. And we have sometimes been venturesome enough to encourage secretly an opinion which was very importunate after orthodox study, that this said pompous orthodoxy (we fear it was a vulgar thought) was somewhat of a "bully" now and then—very swaggering, and very loud, but withal a very great coward as such characters are said to be. His arguments seemed very weak indeed on some points which he would

have to be very important, which he made the foundation of a vast superstructure—the Scriptures he quoted seemed not pertinent, and few, and altogether doubtful in such a position: and as if he suspected that it was a miserable affair, he was very lengthy and very careful in citing testimonies, particularly from the ancients, many of which were, sad to say, *made up*, i.e. manufactured out of the *words* of their author but not in keeping with the spirit. And then he would strive, in order to make the best of his work, to prove that it was an essential part of the truth, and therefore that it belonged necessarily to, and was an indispensable part of Christianity: and then we found it presently dignified as an "article of faith," and before he concluded he managed to work himself into a passion, and finished with "everlasting damnation."

This seemed very ungenerous to say the least. Why should the messengers of peace, and love, and salvation be so very, very fond of sending men to misery and wrath? Why should they always busy themselves in inventing causes of death? How is it they have always had such a love of cursing?

The Inquisition seems to be the natural goal of "orthodoxy." Only give ecclesiastics the power—let them have the opportunity, and they will kill those who refuse to believe them. Nor will they stop there, lest you should comfort yourselves with our Lord's assurance that they can "only kill the body and after that have no more that they can do," they claim to have power over the soul—they damn that also; and if you demur—if you venture to question whether the great God who made us and has said He will judge us would entrust such power to men, why then they will presently and without further enquiry damn you for that too. Anyhow they will curse you and kill you here, and send their curse and their death after you, when you escape from their grasp, to torment you for ever; and they will raise you again, and give you a renewed body and immortal powers that they may have the pleasure of damning you the more effectually. And why? Because you refuse to take their word for that which you are as capable of deciding for yourself as they can be.

That we may not be accused of overstating, or of exaggerating our argument, just think what it is men do in our free, persecution-hating Britain (for all allow the charge we have made as applicable to the Church of Rome), when they excommunicate, or drive out from their community an otherwise worthy and blameless member, simply because he does not agree with them on some one point which they are resolved shall be an essential. Do not they themselves believe they are "delivering him over to Satan"? Do they not speak of him as if he were lost? If they deny this—if they believe him still to be in the way of life, and acknowledge that there is no charge against him which affects his salvation, why do they not treat him as a brother? why are they distant? why alienated? If they really think his God still loves and approves him—if they confess they have no just ground for a contrary opinion, then how is it that they have no love nor approbation for him? how dare they treat him as a heathen and an outcast? But we appeal to the experience or observation of our readers whether they do not *act* eternal perdition to those they have "suspended," or "rejected," whatever they may choose to say.

This opens, we are aware, a great question and we shall perhaps be thought presumptuous in passing judgement thereon. But we confess to very little awe in the sacred presence of "dignitaries"—modern and unscriptural dignitaries we hold them to be—of the class that has generally had the decision in matters of faith. We have before said in the Universalist what we think "the Church" has done for the religion of Jesus. We believe that she who claims to be "the pillar and ground of the truth," has been the greatest stumbling-block to the truth-seeker.

How we should rejoice to see an impartial history of "orthodoxy," to follow it through all its mutations, and to trace its effects in detail so far as was possible. We have such a history—or the outlines of such a history here and there filled up—of ancient orthodoxy; and we know what spirit it was of when the Lord dwelt among men, and how awful were His denunciations against its champions and advocates: and it does seem to us that the orthodoxy of the Christian has become as mischievous, as worldly, as untruthful, as burdensome, we had almost said as *deadly* a thing as that of the Jewish Church. And not only that it is such now but that it has for centuries been such. And if we had but time we should be rejoiced to have the opportunity of going through the history of "the Church," with our finger ever upon orthodoxy, shewing the readers of the "Universalist" that we have good reason for the strong things we have been impelled to say. But our brethren can do this for themselves: only to do it well and truthfully they must not merely read some manual of Church history but they must be many-sided, *every-sided* readers.

The truth is man is afraid of man—religion is even amongst us a superstitious, traditionary, trust-taken thing. None of us has sought for himself honestly, painfully, and manfully. We believe with our families, or our cliques, or our sects, or our churches—whatever name men give them—and if we read at all it is to learn what our advocates say in behalf of our position. This we repeat: and if it is answered we are angry, and dismiss our opponents to the devil. Profane as such expressions may seem to many, yet they are literally descriptive of the fact. We have known many excited disputants when unable to answer the arguments of their opponents, refer at once to the judgment seat of God—"Ah, you will learn then how wrong you are—learn in sorrow unless you should be mercifully taught of the Spirit before that time, see your errors and repent." And both these parties were professedly religious, but they could not allow to each other a hope of heaven without such a change as should bring each to the other's way of belief. We say "way of belief," because there was little difference between them—nothing more than different shades of the same thing—different ways of receiving the same truth. And this has been the spirit of the Church. The stronger the reasons against the stronger party, the fiercer was the persecution, the heavier the denunciation, the more bitter the curse.

The readers of the Universalist however are not likely to be of this class: the bare fact of their believing that all will come at length in God's own time and way to the truth and be saved by it, will sweeten their intercourse with their fellow sufferers for the present, and dispose them to think lightly of differences since they are soon to agree for ever.

Indeed! the change which the general reception of this truth would produce seems to us so great, or likely to be so great, and so greatly for the better, that we are afraid to trust ourselves further lest we should incur the charge of "dreaming."

But you will say, "What has all this to do with Jeremiah White?" We are afraid nothing. And yet it has this much to do with it that all has arisen from the purpose when we set out of telling you the substance of what he said, and what our opinion was of his way of saying it, and our estimate of the service he had done mankind. Somehow, however, we could never go right on—something occured—some thought took possession of us and carried us away which we thought worth uttering, and we have gossipped till the book itself is reappearing in a modern shape, to tell its own story; which we are sure it will do so well that we will be silent aud commend it to the thoughtful, prayerful study of our readers.

NOHDORN.

ON THE FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE OF SCRIPTURE.

CORN OR GRAIN.

It is to be lamented how very few and how very imperfect, have been all the attempts hitherto made to reduce the figurative language of Scripture to anything like rule; and though all the learned have confessed that the Hebrew tongue is one altogether of natural and therefore unchangeable emblems, yet as far as is now known, there has not yet been one attempt to classify these figures according to their natural orders, nor to examine each as thus classified.

It is indeed certain that no one life is sufficient even for a rude survey of these natural figures, which are as diversified as nature itself; but because one life or one generation is insufficent to obtain any thing like satisfactory clearness in this branch of study, is this a cause wherefore it should never be pursued with somewhat of the same perseverance, as is now used in the pursuit of all natural sciences, even the most occult? Must we remain ignorant on this one point only? or can the importance of this study of the figurative language of Scripture be questioned, when it is understood that the emblems supplied by natural objects, which are the types of this language—the diversified and beautiful alphabet—form a medium by which spiritual and unseen things are brought near to the created understanding; and which, when illuminated from above through the shining upon them of the divine mind, are found to open out many mysteries which without their aid must remain closed to the end of time.

Though it is now nearly two thousand years since our Lord's ascension, and though during that time, human learning and human reason have been exercising themselves continually in speculations and criticisms on the revealed Word and the ancient tongues in which it was delivered, and though many have confessed that there are innumerable passages, nay, whole volumes, of the Old Testament especially, which are written wholly and entirely in figura-

tive language, not denying the fact that natural things afford the types by which this language is composed; yet strange to say, a Dictionary and Grammar of this language are as much a desideratum in the learned and self-styled religious world in the 19th. century, as they were in the darkest ages of the church: and whilst the learned and the curious, are and have been straining every nerve to acquire the clue to the understanding of the Egyptian Hieroglyphics, and the still darker Assyrian and Babylonish characters, they not only deem it of small importance to obtain correct and defined ideas of the use made of natural emblems in Scripture, but presume to proceed to the next step in this science of the figurative language of Scripture, and only too often pretend to interpret these still undefined figures; and to build upon these, interpretations, systems, and theories, which may happen to be partially right or entirely wrong as may be, and as it may please the Almighty to permit.

But there is no question that so it was ordained to be, and so it may continue to be, until other ages have rolled onward in which the learned may be permitted still to pass by this very obvious and open door of instruction on to studies, for which they have not fitted themselves, by their acquaintance with their first rudiments. For it is as easy for a passing traveller to interpret a long row of arrow headed characters engraven on some desert rock, as for one to interpret the dark sayings of prophecy without clearly knowing the language of prophecy.

But who is sufficient for the opening out of this ancient tongue? for it is a speech coeval with the creation of the world and the establishment of the heavens, *For the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handy work. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth forth knowledge*, &c. Ps. xix. No mere man indeed: nevertheless he who dictated the letter of these volumes of beautiful and precious figures, will not fail to bestow the power of reading them aright to as many as he shall have appointed so to be enabled to do.

But leaving these reflections, which spring up before every step in the way we are now desiring to go, we wish to make certain remarks, not noticed in our former papers, on this subject of the figurative language of Scripture—remarks which equally belong to all figurative modes of speaking and writing: namely, that the language of figure resolves itself into various orders, distinctions, or classes, it being a gross offence in any sort of composition to break an emblem or simile of any kind; according to which acknowledged rule, it may be seen that the types or figures supplied from a treasury vast and various as creation itself, may, and indeed must necessarily include many and various orders of figures, capable of being worked up into combinations of greater or less beauty, tenderness, and grandeur—these combinations forming parables or allegories.

So comprehensible are each and all of these orders of figures, that it is believed that if we could fully understand them with all their bearings, they would be found primarily to exhibit the Lord in one or more of his especial prerogatives, as the divine man, the Saviour, the victim, the fulfiller of the law, the corporeal or spiritual being, or the receiver of the human nature into the divine, &c. For example, in that order of figures exhibited by natural

human relationships, he is shewn as the Father, Brother, Husband, Son, &c.; where human infirmities and sicknesses is the order, he is exhibited as the Physician, the Healer, and the Balm. Look for him in the woods, and you find him in his glorified state as the tree of life, in his humiliation as the tree of knowledge, in his strength as the oak, in his incorruptibility as the cedar, and in fact, in all and every tree, which is lovely and fragrant, abounding in fruit and refreshing in its shadows. Seek him among the flocks, and you will there find him as the lamb and the sheep, or in the shepherd's tent; raise your eyes above, and you will discern him in the sun and stars, and read in them the mystery of the salvation of all created things, for these heavenly bodies have a tale to tell to all intelligent beings, for there is no speech nor language in which their voice is not heard.

In a regular course of study of the figurative language of Scripture, it would be well no doubt to proceed from the most general subjects to the particular; as, for instance, it might be best to consider the typical significations of the simple elements, before proceeding to the different forms, combinations, and exhibitions of these elements, the student being ready to be convinced that, if the leading idea be inconsistent with the smaller or more minute ramifications thereof as belonging to itself or springing from itself, there is a flaw somewhere, an inconsistency which must be looked into—inconsistencies never really existing in the different parts of revelation, though they may seem to do so in consequence of the imperfection of the created apprehension. It would be most encouraging, therefore, to the student of Scripture emblems, if anything like satisfaction could be obtained as to the spiritual signification of the principal figures of this language; those, for instance, of the leading elements, fire, water, earth, air, of natural life, of the metals, and the various kinds of heavenly bodies set within our view in indefinite space. But we are not yet so far advanced in the intricacies of the language of Scripture emblems, as to be able to go on right forwards to any one point; like persons travelling in a perplexed forest, we must go on, if we proceed at all, wherever there is the smallest opening in the tangled wall of the various vegetation around us. It may be that, after having investigated some few easy subjects, we may advance to where there is some such opening in the maze as shall help us to form more connected notions.

We have already examined the subjects of pastoral images, and of the Sabbath: we will now select that of corn, which is the general name for all grain. *Dahgahn*, signifying to multiply, is the leading word for corn. It is connected with the root signifying to fish, and is the same word with the Dagon of the Philistines. It is often used in the natural sense for corn, and in a figurative for prosperity, under the idea of abundance of bread. There are other words in Hebrew, which are rendered by corn, wheat, and other grain, besides several in Greek, all of which should be separately examined by anyone desiring to go deeply into the subject; for, although there is one leading spiritual signification of the figure supplied by grain in general, yet assuredly each sort of grain denotes some variation in the figure.

But before we go further into this subject, it is necessary to refer to a rule of interpretation, belonging to all sorts of seeds or grain used for food—this rule

being so established as not to bear to be disputed with any shew of reason: this is that tree, herb, or plant bearing such seed, being a type of an individual as will scarcely be disputed by anyone knowing anything of the language of figures, the fruit which such tree, herb, or plant produces, as destined for food, is a type of works, whilst its seed which is sown and which is destined to become itself a plant is a type of like nature with the parent plant; hence, in a general sense, the fruit and the plant bearing the fruit are types of different natures, the fruit, as in the case of grain, being emblematic either of the good works of the individual, represented by the plant, or in case of its being sown of the parent nature, in which it is hereafter to exist. The grain, then, of corn may either be the type of an individual, promising or producing good works, or of such an individual as multiplies itself in dying; for as our Lord himself declareth, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone, but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit.* John xii. 24.

In the highest spiritual sense, then, we may apply this figure of the corn in its two distinct parts to the Lord the Saviour—as principally, the holy seed, confined within the elements of this world as the grain is hidden in the chaff, this chaff being probably as necessary to its existence under the present state of creation, as the body is to the life; and secondarily as being cast to the ground and dying—the great antitype receiving in death that power to multiply himself spiritually, which he could not have enjoyed, whilst under the influence of the elements of this world.

The first appearance of our Lord, then, as manifested by corn or grain, is in the husk and as attached to the stalk and rooted in the earth. The next is, as bare grain divested of all those circumstantials, which connected it with the earth. The third is, as springing again into a new existence after its death in its original form, with the full possession of the power to multiply itself by thousands and tens of thousands, and thousands of thousands. The fifteenth 1 Cor. 35—38 must of course present itself to all readers of Scripture in reference to what is said above. The last appearance therefore of our Lord as one represented by a grain of corn is as the corn in the full ear (Mark iv. 23), a condition which refers to the manifestation of the body of our Lord; this figure, in its most extensive sense, pointing to the time when every member of our Lord's body shall have entered into existence, shall have lived its time in connection with the elements of this world, and shall have been delivered from them for ever and ever.

We next proceed to consider this figure in the second point of view; still, however, with reference to our Lord's natural body, as being represented by grain, when broken and made up into bread for the sustenance of his people. Bread, in a figurative sense, as the principal aliment of the body, is applied to the mind, and is that which it feeds upon, whether bitter or sweet. In the highest spiritual sense it denotes the body of our Lord Jesus, which is the food of his children, he being that bread of life which cometh down from heaven, of which we have abundant proofs in Scripture, and hence we find such complete fulfilment of the type supplied by corn in our Lord and Saviour, as no other being but the divine Man could provide.

But as every beautiful type in nature, has its divine and infinitely glorious antitype, as well as its inferior manifestations, the same in kind though less in degree, of the one first great antitype, so there is in most cases a false or spurious representation of the same figure. One connected or allied to it in some points, and diametrically contrasted in others. In the interpretation of the figurative language of Scripture, it is needful to the elucidation of truths to observe these contrasts as attentively as the similitudes according to which, if the good and full corn denotes, as it does, not only the Lord's body, but its members, it is the figure also of evil persons, enemies of God. See 2 Kings xix. 26, Isaiah xxxvii. 27; see also Pharaoh's dream, in which the figure of the ears of corn is applied to that which is good, and that which is evil. Before this subject is abandoned, it ought to be remarked how strangely even many of the best intentioned ministers have overlooked this circumstance, in their discourses, namely this, that when they hold out terrors to evil doers in comparing them to chaff, and assuring them that as such they will be burned, whilst those who do well &c. shall be gathered into the garner, they do not discern that the chaff, the husk, and the stalk, are parts of the same individual, and can only be two in the same point of view, as the body and soul, or mind of one man, from two individuals. The wheat and the tares may indeed represent two orders of men; a specimen of any sort of grain in its various parts, as successively developed, can only represent one person, under various conditions.

This subject, with many others, belonging to the figurative language of Scripture, is capable of being unfolded to an indefinite extent. But the utmost which is attempted in the little papers on types introduced in the Universalist's Magazine, is to afford some such hints as may induce the Bible Student to investigate this beautiful language for himself.

M. M. S.

CHRISTIAN PRECEPTS THE MIRROR OF GOD'S CHARACTER.

"Do as I say, not as I do," is an injunction which falls powerless upon the ear, from its manifest self-inconsistency; and, though what we *say* may be all very good, if it be contradicted by what we *do*, we have only to expect to be regarded as hypocrites and fools, and the sooner we get out of sight the better.

It is surprising that men who have seen so much of the fruit of this maxim, in such rank luxuriance, should still virtually hold by the Pharisaic course, laying grievous burdens and heavy to be borne upon their fellows, while they will not make even the little finger effort to bear them themselves. It is more surprising still, that the great majority of the Christian world profess admiration of, and desire to exhibit those heavenly virtues of which we are about to speak, while they maintain that the all-wise and infinitely-loving Being who revealed them, pursues a course utterly at variance both with their letter and spirit.

We are content—independently of any of those direct divine assurances to this effect—to rest upon the precepts of our holy religion in proof of our

distinctive faith. We see, in the conduct enjoined upon us in reference to our fellow creatures, the evidence of a world's salvation; and this, because our heavenly Father never tells us to do any thing he could not, and would not, in a like relation, do himself. Is our God a consuming fire? and does he not tell us how to heap coals of fire on our enemy's head? "Ah," we think we hear a defender of eternal flames say, "Wretched perversion! as though God's consuming fire were at all to be compared with the coals of fire the saint of God is to heap on the head of his enemy, in the shape of bread for his hunger, and water for his thirst!" "The saint of God," our opponent says; and what is a saint of God? Is it one who is like or unlike the Being whose holy name he bears? If *like*, upon *this* saint's principle, the bread and water must not be given to the enemy, but must be reserved for the brotherhood only; because God's consuming fire would burn up all the bread, and evaporate all the water, rather than that the enemy should have any! This is not burlesque: we speak the words of truth and soberness when we say, that the *child* of the God, of orthodoxy, who would imitate his father, should not do good unto *all* men, but *only* to those who are of the household of faith; and our representation is complete when the admitted boundless resources of God are considered as cut off from those who are left to their unsubdued enmity in an abyss of endless woe. But coals of fire you may lavishly *heap* upon your enemies head: only, if kindled at any inferior source, instead of being a child of God, you will be a child of the devil.

The precepts of God mirror his character; and the more we see our character reflected in these precepts, the more do we resemble our heavenly father, "For beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, we are changed from glory to glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord." (Rom. xii. 20.)

God, through the Scriptures, teaches us not to be overcome of evil, but to overcome evil with good. (Rom. xii. 21.) Why? Does not popular theology insist, that while God overcomes evil in the case of those whom he here subdues by his grace to himself, he does not overcome evil in their case who are never to be admitted to his presence? And is not this an admission that, instead of overcoming evil, God is actually overcome by *it?* "Ah, [we forgive our friend this second interruption], just as though God could not overcome evil without following the course prescribed by him for his weak, finite child." Then it is admitted that God will overcome evil, but that he will not overcome it in a certain manner. He will not overcome evil with *good*. How, then, will he overcome it? God is good. And if his *children* are enjoined to oppose evil with *good*, will he himself oppose evil with *evil?* will he act contrary to his nature? Will he promote the existence, and encourage the manifestation of his nature in his children, and chide it by his own procedure? No! we are safe in drawing encouragement to carry out this divine precept from the thought that it is our heavenly Father's design not to be overcome of evil, but to overcome *it*, and to overcome it in the only possible and practicable manner, and that is by good. We then, as co-workers with God, may go forth cheerfully to the conquest, for, if God be for us, who can be against us? We maintain that only by *good* can moral evil be overcome. You may restrain a rebellious spirit, you may repress the manifestation of evil, you may enchain the monster by

mere force; but the monster, the evil, remains untouched: moral evil being antagonistic only to moral good, can only be met and vanquished by the power of moral goodness. Not unfrequently the Christian precept is illustrated and enforced by a direct appeal to the example of "*the Good One*" indicating at once the intimate connection between the divine precept and the divine character. For example Christians are not to live for themselves. Christianity is the enemy of selfishness; and, while it seeks the crucifixion of this bad principle, it also supplies the most powerful motive, and the most glorious example. Christians are to live for Christ. For whom did Christ live, and for whom did he die? "He died for *all*, that they who live should not live for themselves, but to him who died for them and rose again." Then to live for Christ is to live for all. The *motive* is the constraining influence of the love of Christ, and we have his *example* in his dying for all. True we may individually benefit but few ; but let all who "*thus judge*," as the apostle argues, but act upon this their deliberate judgment, and the many will be reached : and we have this great satisfaction,—not a mere matter of inference but of direct positive assertion,—that he who died for all, has all power in heaven and earth, and will yet see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied.

Again : the great teacher tells us (Matt. v. 43—48), that if we only love those who love us, we are doing no more than they who are ignorant of Christianity. The heathen do this. Reciprocal love is not a *characteristic* feature of Christianity at all. It approves it in common with other systems. But Christianity goes far beyond, and is infinitely superior to every other system, in that it gives a blessing for a curse, a kiss for a blow, returns cruelty with kindness, and visits injustice with mercy. And while the sublime doctrine is set before his disciples in all its beautiful simpicity, the Saviour, as if to chide any rising unbelief as to the practicability of such conduct, reminds them of their heavenly Father, whose kindness reaches the unthankful and the froward, and whose rain descends alike upon the just and the unjust. Nor was this all. To nothing short of perfection would our Saviour have us aspire, and he concludes his discourse with "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father who is in heaven is perfect." Now wherein does our perfection consist? In being like God. We can only prove ourselves to be God's children by being like him. Jesus says—thus act, that you may evince your high descent—even that you are the children of the Eternal. And he had just before told us in what God's perfection was manifested. Great Father! should I bless and not curse? then thou dost bless them that curse thee ; and they know thee not who say that thou dost curse to all eternity those who have cursed thee. Is it thy will that I show kindness to the ungrateful? then thou art kind to the unthankful; and they know thee not who say that thou wilt for ever torment those who have hitherto received thy favours without acknowledging thy hand. Is it thy will that I love my enemies? then, even as thou dost commend thy love toward us, while yet enemies, in reconciling us to thyself by the death of thy Son, thou pitiest thy foes; and they know thee not who say that thou wilt never overcome the enmity of thy guilty creatures, but wilt imprison them in endless woe. O, for thy Spirit, that I may be like thee, thou only Perfect One!

Once more: having shown that the divine precepts of our religion indicate

the true character of God, we observe that their embodiment in the Christian life must necessarily fail *adequately* to represent the character and actual procedure of the Divine Being. We admit a difference: there is a point beyond which correspondence fails; but this difference is not at all like that which our opponent discovers. The difference is one of degree, and is in our favour. We, *in our measure*, may fully represent the divine conduct. The difference is just this: what we, as *finite*, can only develop in a limited degree, God, as *infinite*, can develop indefinitely. Our light may illumine but a small circumference of which we are the centre; but he who *is light*, will chase away the darkness of all sin,—will remove the covering from over the face of all nations. Our resources are limited; our capabilities of reaching our fallen, degraded, helpless, miserable fellow-creatures, are restricted; but his resources are inexhaustible, and none are sunk so low but his arm can reach them: "his arm is not shortened that it cannot save, neither is his ear heavy that it cannot hear." He can, and because he can, he will "deliver from the *lowest* hell." If we being evil, or imperfect, know how to give good gifts, *how much more* the All-perfect One! If he clothe the grass of the field, and watch the falling of a sparrow, how much more will he care for and succour man! And if he spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how much more will he not freely give us all things!

We might add indefinitely to our illustrations. The call to the exercise of Christian virtue is invariably a declaration of the character of God; and we see that this call is often accompanied by an emphatic appeal to the manifestation of the same virtue in the Deity. The pure in heart shall see, perceive, or have an intuition of God; and none other can, because God is pure: without holiness no man can see the Lord. Be ye holy, *for* I am holy. But all flesh shall see the salvation of God: all then shall be holy. All people shall be blessed in him; all nations shall call him blessed; for God, while he says, *Do as I say*, adds also, *Do as I do*.

Z.

POETRY.

WHAT IS IT?

Unveil'd in the light, all her graces appear,
Nor unto the sight can be shown her compeer.
In love she hath birth; ere the angels of bliss
View'd chaos yield earth from its gloomy abyss.
Eternity's rays, when it dawn'd upon time,
Reveal'd a display of her beauties sublime.
Sin tainted our race; but still she stood by,
And spoke of the grace of our Father on high.
Love, gratitude, law, with a magic divine,
In unison draws to her hallowing shrine.
She breathes on the tomb, and her heavenly breath
Makes Paradise bloom in the shadow of death.

A. C. Thomas.

DR. THOLUCK AND THE PROSPECTUS OF "THE UNIVERSALIST."

When we issued the Prospectus of *The Universalist*, now nearly twelve months ago, we were informed by a correspondent at Brighton, that a clergyman of that town who had seen it, had preferred against us the charge of having misrepresented the celebrated Dr. Tholuck, in placing him at the head of the German Evangelical divines, who, we alledged, now proclaimed the doctrine of universal salvation, or had, at least, ceased to defend the doctrine of endless punishment. The following conversation, quoted from "Communications of the Rev. Barnas Sears, D.D., recently Professor in the Baptist Theological Seminary at Newton, and now Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education," we think will fully justify the paragraph in question, and we commend it to the consideration of our readers generally, and to the demurring clergyman in particular.

"But the most painful disclosures remain yet to be made. Though as a theologian, Dr. Tholuck is on the side of orthodoxy, it must be remembered that it is the orthodoxy of Germany. I feel the more called upon to state frankly what I know to be the truth, from the fact that the works of several German critics, of whom he is the safest, have now become so popular in England and America, as to demand a translation. *This distinguished and excellent man, in common with the great majority of the evangelical divines in Germany*, though he professes to have serious doubts, and is cautious in avowing the sentiment, *believes that all men and fallen spirits will finally be saved.* The current hypothesis is, that, in the middle state intervening between death and the resurrection, the righteous will gradually attain to perfection, and that, to all the wicked, whether men or angels, the gospel will be preached, and that they will ultimately accept it and be restored.

"Professor Olshausen is the most popular commentator on the New Testament of the modern evangelical school. Let us hear what he says on this subject. In the new edition of 1833, vol. i. p. 412, he observes that there have been many Universalists in all ages, but *there are more in this age than there ever were before.* Although this *may often be owing* to a sickly and torpid state of the moral feelings, *yet it is without doubt deeply rooted in noble minds* ; it is the longing of the soul after complete harmony in the universe."

"But we have not yet done: we have still to add, that, with Dr. Tholuck, who has in London more than once made public speeches in English, we have often discussed this subject *in English.* Does our traveller boast of superiority also here? One evening, at his house, there was a debate between us on this subject, in the presence of two American gentlemen, now in this country. It made such a painful impression on the mind of the writer, that he can remember not only the ideas, but many of the identical words and phrases, employed at the time. The following is the substance of that conversation, which was held in *English*:—

"*Tholuck.* I suppose my American brethen would consider me orthodox in general, except my Universalism.

"*S.* They would, most certainly. But with them that point would be a serious matter. With this sentiment you could not hold a standing in our orthodox churches. Now, where did you find this doctrine,—in the Bible, or in your philosophy?

"*Tholuck.* In both.

"*S.* What are the passages of Scripture on which you principally rely?

"*Tholuck.* My main passage is 1 Cor. xv. 28: Christ shall overcome all, and bring them into complete subjection to God, who to all men will be their all, their every thing. Such language cannot well be applied to those who shall still remain his enemies. Also Rom. xi. 36: For out of him and through him, and into him, are all things; that is, all things proceed out of him as the source of being; by him they are conducted to their proper destination; and into him they all return, as their eternal resting place. It follows, of course, that they will all be happy, for happiness consists in being *in* God. Another passage is, "Every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess," &c.

"*S.* Do you find no passages of Scripture which positively declare the everlasting punishment of the wicked?

"*Tholuck.* Yes: Matt. xxv. 46, and others like it.

"*S.* Can those passages, which you think favor Universalism, be understood in any other sense without violating the fundamental laws of interpretation?

"*Tholuck.* Yes, they *can*, but the construction would not be so easy and natural.

"*S.* Can the other passages, which speak of endless punishment, *possibly* bear any other construction?

"*Tholuck.* I do not see how they can.

"*S.* Well, what are you going to do with them?

"*Tholuck.* That is my only difficulty. These two classes of texts seem to me contradictory; I cannot reconcile them. But when I reflect upon the character of God, as a Being of *love*, I lose all my doubts. Those passages are dark, but here all is light. Man has not utterly lost God's image; there is something holy in him still,—the flaming eye of God, the conscience; and wherever there is this foothold, God will gain the heart at last. Were it not for this traitor in the enemy's camp, it would be impossible for God to save sinners.

"*S.* Americans do not use the word *holy* in such a connection. We do not apply it to one's *essential nature*, which cannot be changed, but to *moral character*, which is susceptible of change. To say that man has a conscience, is only to say that he is a man. This is what, in the nature of things, can never be lost. Devils have consciences, and are moral agents, as much as men; and if there is something holy where there is conscience, there is something holy in devils, and there is this foothold for God, this traitor in the camp, there, and consequently they also can and will be saved.

"*Tholuck.* To be sure: this is what I hold."

Was St. Paul a Universalist?—We have received the following anecdote from a friend in New Bedford. It shows the ignorance and bigotry of certain professors of religion. Is is not wonderful that such persons should think themselves the peculiar friends of God, and entitled to eternal glory on account of their religious knowledge and acquirements? It may perhaps be explained on the ground, that ignorance is the parent of the greatest absurdities.

A Calvinist Baptist, a member of a Baptist Church in the town of G——, asserted in the hearing of a number of persons, that St. Paul was a Calvinist Baptist. "Should St. Paul" said he, "arise from the dead and preach in our meeting-house, (no one knowing the man or his sentiments,) and should the inquiry be made after meeting, What denomination was the preacher? the universal answer would be, He is a Baptist." A lady sitting by, thought that it would require as great a miracle to make a Baptist of St. Paul, as it would to raise him from the dead, and introduce him into the Meeting-house at G——. "But," continued she, "should St. Paul deliver a discourse in this place, and

affirm from the pulpit that 'God will have all men to be saved,'—that he 'will gather together all things in Christ,' what denomination should you conclude he belonged to?" The Baptist not knowing these were Paul's words, answered, "Paul would have too much knowledge to preach such a licentious doctrine as that." "But *suppose he should so preach*," continued the lady, "what should you call him?" "Why, I should say he was a despicable Universalist; and if he so preached, I should leave the house immediately." The lady presented him with a Bible opened to those places in Paul's writings. He looked at them, and exclaimed, "Ah! you have got a Universalist Bible, which ought to be burned. If you hear such delusion as that, you must be for ever miserable."

Rule of Criticism.—It is a rule of criticism, self-evidently just, and universally admitted in the interpretation of all writings, that passages few or obscure are to be explained in conformity to those which are numerous and clear, and especially in conformity to great, leading, and unquestionable principles; whence it necessarily follows, even though we should never be able to give a satisfactory explanation of such passages, so as to show what they really mean, we may be always certain what they *do not mean*.

This rule is particularly applicable in the case of the inspired writings, as being alone perfectly consistent, or free from contradiction.

R. R.

On Matthew xvi. 9.—Make such a liberal use of your present advantages, that, in the approaching time of such unparalleled trouble as will oblige you to abandon your earthly possessions, they may receive you (an idiom for *ye may be received*) into etaneous habitations, in the life of the age, and the salvation, or deliverance connected with it. I consider the exhortation as equivalent to that in 1 Tim. vi. 17—19, "Charge them who are rich in the present age, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in the uncertainty of riches, but in the living God, who giveth us all things richly to enjoy: that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, liberal, laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time about to come; that they may lay hold on etaneous life."

Ibid.

REVIEW.

Ireland as I saw it; the Character, Condition, and Prospects of the People. By Wm. S. Balch. New York: Hallock and Lyon. London: H. K. Lewis. 1850.

(*Concluded from our last.*)

But to return from this long digression, to our author and his "Ireland, as I saw it."

Such is the nature of his work, that it is absolutely impossible for us to treat of it, except piece-meal. While in some respects it commands our unqualified approbation, there are others in which we deem it decidedly open to censure.

That we may be able satisfactorily to explain ourselves, as well as to do justice to Mr. Balch, we shall consider his production under a threefold aspect:—First, as a record of what he saw and heard; secondly, as a repertory of observations on the social state of Ireland, and the policy of its rulers; and, thirdly, as interspersed with general and miscellaneous remarks and suggestions.

First. Viewed as a collection of memoranda, or as a record of the author's

personal observations and experience, the book is truly excellent. Even independently of our own aquaintance with the country, already referred to, we could have trusted implicitly to Mr Balch's statements of what he saw and heard. He is a thoroughly honest man. He looked sharply about him, and he has related, with as much accuracy as his memory assisted by his note-book could impart, and occasionally with no small degree of vivacity, the facts and circumstances, the scenes and parties which came under his notice. Occasionally in his descriptions, such as those respecting Killarney and the lakes and mountains in its neighbourhood, he rises almost to the sublime. Upon his susceptible mind, indeed, the grandeur and beauties of that part of the country appear to have made a deep and abiding impression. The quaintness and angularities of the Irish character he could scarcely fail observing. His conversations with parties are generally related in a manner the most graphic. He places the interlocutors before our mind's eye; and without apparently any sacrifice of truth, by means of suggesting exactly their demeanour, ideas, and language, he contrives to impart a perfectly dramatic effect to the whole. The narrative portions of the work are full of interest. But instruction rather than amusement, has evidently been his object. Although never descending to such a minuteness and ludicrousness of detail, as Bentley, in the Preface to his "Dissertations on the Epistles of Phalaris," ridicules in the case of Dr. King, himself the banterer of another:—"He answered me, that he had a thousand such sort or liquors, as '*humtie-dumtie, three-threads, four-threads, old Pharaoh, knockdown, hugmetee,*' &c."*—he yet never neglects to supply us with the information which, in such a work as his, we had a right to expect. He describes to us with sufficient but not tiresome or disgusting particularity, the provisionss modes of living, and dwellings of the peasantry with whom he was brought into contact. Sometimes the scenes to which he introduces us are absolutely "soul-harrowing;" but they could not with propriety have been omitted, and his good sense and good taste always dictate the point at which to stop. His account of a meal partaken of by himself and Mr. Havemeyer with a poor Irish family, of the family itself, and of the dialogue which took place between its members and him, pp. 192—198, is so characteristic and so instructive, tha but for want of room, we should have transcribed it at length. Perhaps, as a fair specimen of our author's descriptive and dramatic powers, our readers will accept the following, which relates to what occured at Tarber, as he and his companion in travel were about to step on board the steam boat on the Shannon, with the view of proceeding to Limerick. The parties alluded to were emigrants about to leave for America.

"These requests followed the adieus, as if the anxiety to get to America transcended all other considerations. I stopped behind till one or two boat loads had passed from the pier; and remarked, that those who had parted from their friends entered at once and cheerfully into conversations upon the plans and prospects of getting to America. Some of them thought they could go next year. Their daughters could earn ten and fifteen pounds a year, and that would pay the passage of father and mother, and one or two sisters. Others expected to be obliged to wait two years. One man said if he could sell his farm he would go next fall. [Autumn.] I asked him if he had a farm. He said, he had one of ten acres.—'Do you own it,' asked I.—'Och, sure I have the right of it. I paid a hundred pound for it, and I wish I could sell it for half the amount.'—'I thought you had no small farmers here; that the lords and gentry owned all the land, and only leased it to you.'—'An' they do; but sure an' I own it too, for I bought the lease of it, and pay the rint to the landlord, an' the county-cess an' the tithes, an' the poor-rates; till i' faith we are all poor ourselves. We are all small farmers, an' poour ones too, I can assure yer riverence that. An' ye're an Englishmn,—an agent, perhaps, an' would like to knoo soome thing aboot our things?'—'No, I am not an Englishman, nor an agent, but ——' 'Are ye not an Englishman, ayeh? The —— a bit can ye decaive me in that, an' ye would be afther sayin' so a twelvemonth. Sure, an' is'nt it as yer hat on yer head, ye are no Irishman. Ye do not spake like a coounthrymen of oours.'—'I am an American, Sir.'—An' its an Amirican ye are? Blissed Virgin, an' its a great Coounthry ye are coome

* Bentley's "Phalaris:" preface, p. xxi. Ed. Lond. 1836.

from, it is, an' I wish I was there. When did ye coome to this coounthry? Its a poour people we are coome to. The Lord have mercy upon us.'—And then followed a tornado of questions and remarks from him and others, about 'Ameriky' and those who had gone there; whether I knew 'Patrick O' Flaherty, an' Michael O' Grady, an' Daniel Mc Sweeny, an' James Mc Carthy, an' Patrick O' Sullivan, who all went from Ballybunnian, Abbeyfeale, Carrinakilly, Ballinruddery, Tallymore, Ardfert, Abbey, an' all aboot this region, an' soome from County Clare, joost over the river there, who were all cliver men and shmart.' When I protested I did not know them, he was much surprised—though some had gone to Canada, and others to New Orleans." pp. 201—203.

Take also the following, which treats of matters which occurred, while our author was sailing up the Shannon.

"Soon after coming aboard, some travelling musicians commenced playing several airs, among which were, 'Yankee Doodle,' 'Hail Colombia,' 'The Star-Spangled banner,' &c." "I could not fail to remark the pleasure which these tunes seemed to afford others, as well as ourselves. We felt as if we were at home during their performance. When the musician came round with his cap for a contribution, we asked him how he came to play so many American tunes.—'Och' said he, 'an' did'nt we know ye're Amerikins? an'——,an' would'nt we do somethin' to plase ye, who coome from that blissed coounthry, which fed us when we were stharvin'?'—'But,' said I, 'you ought to play, 'God save the Queen,' for she is your sovereign.—'The——abit do I care for the Quane; its a small bit o' praise that I'd be afther givin' her, anyhoo. Its Ameriky that I loove; it is moore than England, an' all the Kings and Quanes in the world.'—'Yes, but ye should be true and loyal.'—Its thrue an' loyal to our oppressors, ye would have us? Sorra a bit uv it will I be afther givn them at all, at all. Aych, praise the min that make us stharve? ye do noo such thing in yer coonthry, an' I knoo, I do: an' its the same that I'll not do aither, begorra,'—'Well, here's a sixpence for your blarney; and you must play some of the tunes over again, or else give us some Irish airs.'—An' sure, its noo bluarney, that I'm afther givin' ye, at all. It's the thruth that I'm tellin' ye, when I spake of Amiriky; that same blissed coountry, an' the people in it. May the blissed Virgin presaarve it, till I git there, afoore long.—'But how did you come to know that we were Americans?'—'Och, sure, an' are not yer coollars turned down, as noo gintilmin but Amirikins have 'em.' A little piqued that our nationality was so easily detected, only because it might prevent our mingling with the freedom we desired, among all classes, and securing a confidence which would enable us to form a true estimate of what we saw, I remarked to him he had better play some British tunes, to humour the pride of the Englishmen, and they would give him more liberally. 'The —— a farthin' moore will they be afther givin' me, nor that naither, an' I would play them all the tunes in the kingdom. It's not the same I'd plase at all. ——, I'll not sthain my shoul with so great a sin, as to plase the min that oppriss an' ruin my counthry.' This was said with an air of defiance quite common with a class of the people, when speaking of England. An inveterate hostility is cherished towards that nation, and all their misfortunes and misery are set to the account of English interference—high rents, heavy taxes, potato rot, and all. No matter if the landlord is an Irishman, and the middle-man lays on the exorbitant rents, or through small farmers charge enormously for con-acres. England is at fault for everything. But for the Union, all would go well. 'Repeal' that, and the waste lands, and undrained bogs, would produce bountifully, and Ireland would be a paradise again, as in the days of the great Saint Patrick. Such is the dream of these wretched people. They are ignorant, and consequently easily led by those who have their confidence, and blind and bigoted when once an opinion is formed."—pp. 213—215.

Secondly, we find ourselves, most reluctantly, obliged to condemn a very large portion of our author's comments on the character and social condition of the the Irish people, and the policy pursued by the English Government towards them. These comments exhibit sad prejudice on the part of Mr. Balch. Perpetually is he obtruding upon us the most one-sided and partial views in relation to the topics in question. The Irish, especially the Roman Catholic part of them, are, in his opinion, a most unjustly used and oppressed race; and the English proprietors are little else than a body of cold-blooded, heartless, and cruel despots. With them the government is associated in a league to exterminate, if possible, the Celtic population of the island, *per fas atque per nefas*. To his language of apology for the feelings and deeds of the Irish, and of condemnation of the landed proprietors and English authorities, we find opposed unquestionably a few exceptions. But partisanship in favour of

the one, and against the other, may be said to constitute one of the chief, as it is one of the most painful characteristics of Mr. Balch's book. Now we are very far from charging our author with any *mala fides* in what he writes in the shape of comment on Irish complaints and Irish wrongs. He is evidently quite sincere in the convictions to which he gives utterance. Pained, however, are we to be obliged to tell him, and to tell those who might otherwise be led astray by his vituperations and indignant invectives, that, although not without a certain *substratum* of truth for the theory which he endeavours to pile up, he writes in deplorable ignorance of Ireland and its history. Had he, before visiting the country, at all events before sitting down to the composition of his book, taken the trouble to peruse so common, and at the same time so brief, and condensed, and instructive a compilation, as Leland's "History of Ireland,"*—a work to which we confess ourselves indebted for no small share of our own information respecting its former state and condition—or could he have procured and gone over the able and most impartial account of his visit to the island, which was published by the late Henry David Inglis, Esq. (great-grandson of Colonel Gardiner), about fifteen or twenty years since, he would have had many of the mistakes into which he has been unconsciously betrayed, happily corrected, and would have been enabled to look at his subject in a larger, a more comprehensive and a more accurate point of view.† Ireland is not a theme to be learned and thoroughly understood in a day.‡ In the study of its history, whether past or present, writers of the O'Connell School are most unsafe guides to trust to. Smith O'Briens, Mitchells, and Meaghers, in their invectives, are far more frequently the expositors of their own feelings and wishes, than of facts. Led by such men, no wonder Mr. Balch, with misery in its most appalling forms staring him in the face, and with strong republican biasses of his own, should, in his political diatribes, have erred so frequently and so egregiously as he has done. He could not, circumstanced as he was, help it. But we certainly regret, that he did not take pains to inform himself better.—Mr. Balch must not mistake us. We are not out and out apologists for or admirers of English domination in Ireland, or disposed to subscribe to all that Orangemen have said concerning the halcyon days which it enjoyed while subject to their sway. Well do we know that the sister island was, in past days, and in too many respects, a sadly misgoverned country. Well do we know that from the invasion of Strongbow downwards to the reign of George III., whether under its Tyrones, Straffords, and Ormonds, or its Tyrconnels, its Bramhals and its Boulters, jobbery and chicanery, and public and private spoliation have been enacted on its soil. Viceroys we know, have but too frequently used or rather abused their authority in trampling under foot its wretched people; and time was when landlords treated their tenantry as little better than serfs, produced and living for the purpose of swelling their revenues and executing their behests. Extravagance and profligacy in high places, and rent wrung to the uttermost farthing from abject poverty, have, in past ages, constituted the prominent features of Ireland's social condition. But admitting all this, will any one, even in the slightest degree conversant with the subject,

* Our own edition of this work is the third, published at Dublin, 1774.

† Archbishop Ranuccini's "Mission as Papal Nuncio to Ireland, from 1645 till 1649," might serve, should it come into his hands, to afford Mr. Balch some idea of the lamentably and almost incurably distracted state of Ireland, during a period when Roman Catholics had things very much their own way; and that part of Carlyle's "Cromwell," which respects the proceedings of England's future Protector, as Lord Lieutenant and Commander-in-chief in Ireland, 1649—50, would bring under our author's notice the steps taken by that great man, and taken by him successfully, to raise it from its depressed condition, and restore to it the blessings of peace, good order, and prosperity. A perusal of the work last alluded to would tend to assuage our author's feelings of resentment, and modify the severity of his language, towards Cromwell: as it imparts (besides throwing light on the masterly nature of his Irish policy), with regard to some events, especially the storming of Drogheda, correcter views of facts than are to be met with in the pages of certain well-known and popular historians.

‡ That consummate statesman, the late Sir Robert Peel, emphatically pronounced Ireland to constitute the leading difficulty of every English administration.

venture to maintain, that the blame is all on one side? Can it be denied that to the Irish themselves, a very large, perhaps, the larger portion of their own sufferings, privations, and grievances may fairly be imputed? Have Irish Celtic filth and sloth—have priestly intolerance, Romish intrigue, and popish abominations—has unreasoning and ungovernable impulse—have subserviency, fraud, and cruelty, combined with a marked disposition to perpetuate a state of things little removed from utter barbarism, had nothing to do with that almost hopeless condition, mental and bodily, in which the millions of the sister isle have so long and so abjectly lain? Have not the priesthood of their own choice, and a priest-led people, thrown every obstruction, conceivable and possible, in the way of the benefits sought to be conferred on the country by its best and truest well-wishers and friends? The Bible, that grand standard of morals as well as source of spiritual illumination, the Irish have treated with scorn; education, except as conducted on sectarian principles and in compliance with the wishes of Romish agitators, they have spurned;* and those noble and liberal Saxon Institutions under the shade of which England has grown and flourished, and in the possession of which America herself rejoices, they have shewn themselves to be utterly unfit for, by impeding to the utmost their humanizing and civilizing influences, and by perverting their forms to the worst and most nefarious purposes. Frequently has it occured to us to think, that at the bottom of Ireland's present condition lie the facts, that she has not been treated wisely, systematically, and thoroughly as a semi-barborous country; that too many attempts have been made to reason her into a sense of her true interests, instead of by means of a series of salutary measures forced on her, and firmly but temperately persevered in, doing her good in spite of herself; and that there have been prematurely conferred on her rights and privileges, for which previous training and previous habits not having qualified her population, weapons have been put into her hands, whereby she has been enabled but too successfully to combat and defeat her own improvement. Children and savages behove to be dealt with, not by the language of gentle remonstrance, *Why do ye such things?* (1 Sam. ii. 23), or by relaxed discipline, but by the steady and sternly inflexible, although judicious exercise of authority.† Had Cromwell, so little understood, and so much hated and maligned by the Irish, as well as so bitterly censured by our author himself, had his life prolonged; had the dissensions of his native country, and the instability of affairs at home, permitted him to turn the whole bent and energies of his mighty mind to the state and circumstances of Ireland; and had succeeding governments, animated by his spirit, unflinchingly, impartially and enlightenedly trodden in his steps, judging from what he actually did accomplish, a very different aspect of things would have been presented by the sister country, from what now meets the eye. Ireland in that case would not be now, what for ages she has been, the opprobrium not only of England but of Europe. The grand curse of that country has been the constant alterations of treatment to which by her own turbulence, by political quacks of every description, and by means of changes incessantly occuring in the English counsels and rulers, she has been subjected: hers have been fever fits succeeded by chilling agues; at one time, the victim of savage and relentless cruelty, at another, the spoiled child of indulgence. No one course of policy, be it good or bad, has been long persevered in. What country—what individual—so dealt with, could have prospered?—But farther. To Mr. Balch and his fellow citizens, with ears open only to the one-sided polities of a certain party, we would say, remember, that

* Who can forget the Papal anathema against "the godless colleges"? Such is a specimen of the manner in which England's attempts at kind, conciliating, and impartial treatment of her Irish brethren, are almost sure of being received.

† "The judges in the law courts were terrified; [this is speaking of the relaxed state of things, which, in 1640—41, succeeded Strafford's rigorous administration;] and a scrupulous adherence to the exact line of law and constitutional liberty, had a different effect in Ireland, from what might be expected from the theory of polities; here it served to render the administration contemptible to a people who had been used to a government of rigour and severity."—*Leland*, vol. iii. p. 74. [It is just the fable of King Stork and King Log, realized.]

in Ireland papists have not been the only sufferers. Protestants have sustained injuries innumerable and incalculable, at the hands of short-sighted and scandalous administrations, as well as at those of their popish countrymen. Think of the usage which protestant proprietors, and the protestant community met with from Roman Catholics, during their ascendancy from 1641 till 1649, and from James II. while he held temporary sway, 1689, 1690. Think of the memorable law against agistment tithe, which operated exclusively to the detriment of the protestant clergy, and which must have been. to say the least of it, as acceptable to popish proprietors, as it was to protestant ones. Think of the wholesale massacre of protestants in 1641, a measure concerted and perpetrated in cold blood, and marked by circumstances of peculiar atrocity; as well as of the providentially frustrated attempt to imitate it, which was made in some parts of the island, in 1798. Ireland's woes and wrongs form, it is true, a large chapter of British History. But Ireland's follies, self-inflictions, and scornful rejection of what if carried into effect would have redounded to her advantage, forms one still larger. When, alas! has improvement ever proceeded from herself? At the present moment,it is by her own stubborn refusal of needful ameliorations, by her incessant efforts to defeat the benevolent intentions of the legislature, by her blind and infatuated submission to religious agitators, and by her perseverance in a system of assassinations which have made her very name loathesome to the friends of freedom, good order and humanity, that she is principally injured.* England, by her too tardy enactment and administration of that harsh but salutary remedy, the poor law, and by means of the "Encumbered Estates' Act,"† is doing her good, in her own despite. Sadly inadequate to meet the full exigencies of the case, no doubt appear to us to be the steps hitherto taken. But some of them, (we wish we could say all,) are steps decidedly in the right direction.—Mr. Balch is most severe, and sometimes even unmeasured in his strictures on the present inhabitants of England, and their present rulers, for their procedure towards Ireland. This is most thoughtless, as well as unjust. Granting the existence of every grievance of which the sister country has reason to complain, why upon the heads of the present generation of Englishmen, should the entire blame of them be visited? As well, and as justly, visit upon the heads of the present generation of citizens of the United States of America, the blame of slavery and its abominations, existing under the banner of their Republic. Ireland's wrongs, be they what they may, have not been the creation of Englishmen now alive; nay, it is exceedingly questionable, if by far the majority of them be the result of English interference, and English rule at all. Its evils, social and political, so far from being of yerterday's growth, can be traced back for centuries; and many of them have a wondrously indigenous look, bearing a striking family resemblance to evils which we know to have existed, anterior to pope Adrian's grant, and King Henry's conquest. Such as they are, and whatever may be their origin, they constitute, however, a perfectly Augean stable of abominations. They are in almost in every conceivable form encrusted on Irish society; indeed, in

* To which may be added, the offensive and insulting position she is assuming towards England, in the holding of a Roman Catholic council. under a prelate invested with legatine authority—a sort of assertion of an *imperium in imperio*—a step, except in the case of the Synod at Clonmacnoise, 1649, not taken since the English Conquest; and the success of the efforts made by her Popish prelates and clergy, to keep up in the breasts of the common people an inveterate feeling of hostility towards England, and of hatred towards all professors of the reformed religion.

† Surely this act, passed in the Session of 1849, in the interval between Mr. Balch's visit, and the appearance of his book, must in its principles and workings meet with his unqualified approbation, if we are to judge from the following language of his:—"The first reform that Ireland needs, is the breaking up of those immense estates, to pay off, by the actual transfer of landed property, the vast debts of these bankrupt landlords. All others are vain and worthless without it. If the poor could not buy a single one, a class of men would do so for the investment of property, which could not fail to yield a handsome income. And their interest would become blended with the prosperity of their tenants, to some extent greater than now.... Other reforms would follow, and Ireland would become a united, prosperous, and happy nation, the right arm of England, and loyal to a fault."—p. 141. Such is the act in question; and such, it is to be hoped, will in due time be the happy results of its operation.

some respects, they may be said to enter into its very constitution and essence. Under such circumstances, as political Hercules' are somewhat scarce, and as the British constitution does not admit of our rulers dealing with even acknowledged abuses *a la Napoleon*, is it too much to suggest to Mr. Balch the impropriety, to use no harsher term, of heaping censures upon the present or any immediately preceding administration, because masses of such abuses still remain unredressed? Obliged as every political measure is in this country—and the same is the case in the United States—to pass through the ordeal of certain forms, before it can become law; and obliged as the members of a constitutional government are in every case to propose not what is best, but what a legislature influenced by the wishes of its constituents may be inclined to concede,—are members of the English Cabinet, impeded and frustrated at every step by such forms, and by the opposition of a nation ignorant, distracted, and priest-ridden, to be run down for the continuance of a state of things which, did circumstances permit, they would be but too happy to remove? Let Mr. Balch be reasonable. If Ireland be miserable, Ireland has herself, in no small degree, to blame for it.—We have never questioned, nay we are certain, that our author witnessed within its precincts, much and appalling wretchedness. A considerable proportion of this, however, he might have been aware, was due to the then recent failure of the potato crop. Does this, Mr. Balch himself being judge, afford matter for legitimate censure? Could any government have foreseen that melancholy catastrophe; or, foreseeing it, could the adoption of any measures, in the actual condition of the island, have averted the calamities consequent on its occurence?* Were we possessed of any influence over Mr. Balch's mind, it would be exerted in endeavouring to induce him to re-consider and re-write the greater part of his strictures, on the political state, and social evils of Ireland.

Thirdly. Our author's miscellaneous observations challenge, on the whole, our decided approbation. Although some times bearing marks of haste in composition, they are almost invariably characterised by enlargement of mind, strong practical sense, considerable aquaintance with the world, detestation of every species of pretence and hypocrisy, and enlightened benevolence. Tinged of course they are by his notions of Universalism, as well as by his republican education and biasses. They embrace a great variety of topics: such as the extent and capabilities of Irish bog land, emigration, education, the constitution and institutions of the United States, and so on. Some very useful hints are given to intending emigrants. Few things in Mr. Balch's work have pleased us more than his able, searching, and sometimes even indignant exposures of the nature and evils of Popery. Omitting a passage at page 22, simply for want of room, we cannot resist the inclination to quote the following:—

"The effect of Romanism has been, and ever will be, to produce the most abject subserviency, wherever its control is unresisted. It demands, as cited above, the destruction of all individualism, and an entire submission to the will of another whom it acknowledges as master. Through the accepted superior, the command of God comes to them; and they become the supple tools in the hands of the skilful and designing, to work out the problems of pride and oppression. And every other system which fetters the liberty of the will, enslaves the conscience, or binds down the soul by forms of faith or rules of practice, by mere *authority*, [human authority, from what follows, appears to be meant, for if applied to God's authority, the sentiment is infidel,] other than the force of truth and the conviction of right, becomes the tyrant by usurping what belongs to God alone....It is a most daring assumption for any

* Surely the sum of eight millions sterling (nearly forty millions of dollars), so promptly and generously voted by England's legislature to Ireland, in the hour of her distress, may be allowed by our author to be some little set off, against that well-timed bounty of American citizens, of which Captain De Kay was the bearer, to which he so frequently alludes, and of which, certainly with justice, he is so proud. Because Ireland snapped at the finger of her by whom, before America's interference, she was fed, this affords no reason why a man of sense and honour, like Mr. Balch, should imitate her example.

man, or set of men, to pretend to apprehend all truth; to pretend to possess the right to set up barriers, beyond which another may not go, but at his peril. None *but* one who thinks himself infallible, or in the exercise of 'a divine right,' will have the audacity to step between God and his child, to disturb the sacred relation which exists as is acknowledged in the gospel. [For the sake of the valuable general principle here presented and insisted on, we pass over Mr. Balch's particular misapplication of it here. God's word on earth speaks to and is heard by the church alone; it neither addresses, nor is it heard by the world. Matt. xiii. 9.] If kings or prelates could exhibit the proof of knowledge sufficient to determine for all others, and did they never change their places, nor [or] alter their views, there would be, at least, some consistency in their claims. But, so long as they are like us, or we like them, we cannot bury our identity, or shirk our own responsibility [see a preceding protest,] under the shadow of their pretended greatness and authority. The practical working of these principles, politically, religiously, and socially, have been fully tested on Ireland. And here the fatal lesson is read, in the filthy hovels, tattered garments, wan faces, crushed hearts, and superstitious observances of this whole nation. Not many among them feel the dignity and freedom of a child of God. Not many dare stand up and say, 'In God's name I do it.' All say, 'It is by permission! I dare not eat meat on Friday, because the priest says I must not.' But there is no longer need of such a law in Ireland, for few can get it on that or any other day of the week. Irishmen can never rise in the scale of moral excellence, till this monstrous yoke is taken from them. When that is done, they may begin to hope, for they will *feel* a freedom and a responsibility to which they are now strangers. They will start up the ascent of a moral elevation, down which they have been forced by the oppressions of Church and State. Each advance will encourage to bolder efforts, till every stumbling block shall be taken out of the way, and they will run fearlessly in the heavenward race, with the glittering prize before them. [Again we protest. The removal of popery would be the removal of much evil. But removal of popery is not exactly identical with spiritual religion.] The multitude who bow at the tinkling of a bell, or cross themselves at a particular signal, in a church, while service is going on in a language they do not understand, are acting mechanically, not from conviction; [not from knowledge, Mr. B. means] not as men should act whose souls commune with God, and drink in his spirit of wisdom and liberty. They are honest, sincere, devout [negatively, not positively so]; and so are the worshippers of Buddha, and the followers of Mahomet. Are they wise? Do they comprehend? Is it judgment, or habit; free-will, or cowering submission? The unbiassed mind does not hesitate to give an answer." —pp. 152—154.

With so clear and distinct an apprehension of popery as one of the main ingredients in the cup of Ireland's wretchedness, how came Mr. Balch to indulge in such violent tirades against England and England's rulers, as if from them exclusively that wretchedness had sprung? With his naturally vigorous understanding, how came he to overlook the facts of England's efforts to enlighten her Irish subjects, and the counteraction to all these efforts which she has incessantly encountered from that spirit of popery, which he here so powerfully exposes, and so eloquently condemns?

But we must hasten to a close.

A work which, in spite of all its drawbacks and imperfections, is so valuable as that now lying before us, deserves the consideration, not only of the man of leisure and general reading, but of the patriot and the philanthropist. Dealing as it does with Ireland's wrongs, and suggesting appropriate remedies, if not always perfectly accurate in tracing to their true origin the one, or very profound and original in regard to the other, there is a tone of pure humanity and sound common sense pervading it, which entitles its author to attention and respect. There has been, to use Burns's phrase,

"A chiel amang us takin' notes,"

who has since "printed" and published them in the remote land from which he came; and who, in so doing, has evinced that to acute powers of observation he unites no small share of knowledge of what mankind are, and of how, under ordinary circumstances, they should be dealt with. That great difficulties lie in the way of the redress of Irish grievances, even he himself, prejudiced although in some respects he be, is aware. And the desirable, he is constrained to admit, is not always the practicable. Gratifying is it to be able to say of Mr. Balch,

that he writes honestly—that he writes feelingly—that he writes earnestly. His desire is, as a citizen of the world, and a member of the brotherhood of man, to see Ireland rescued from her present state of degradation and misery, and raised to that position of social and political eminence, to occupy which so many physical circumstances, and the manifest ability of her inhabitants, conspire to qualify her. For this we thank him, as Britons and as men. Even when harsh, and decidedly unjust in the judgments which he pronounces on England and her rulers, we confess that his rebukes have *some* foundation, and ascribe his excess of censure to generosity of character, and zeal in the cause of humanity—ascribe it to his partial acquaintance with the subject, rather than to any intention to misrepresent or exaggerate. Glad are we to observe that in America his work has already reached a second edition.

Will Mr. Balch excuse us, if, before parting with him, and parting with him with much kindly feeling and good will, we bring under his notice some violations of good taste, which disfigure his book? Passing over a good deal of very questionable language employed with reference to the English nobility, and Irish landed proprietors, we confine ourselves to one particular blemish. We mean, his treatment of a lady. "Her Royal Majesty [Queen Victoria], rules his Royal Highness [Prince Albert], it is said, with a rod of iron." p. 52, "The tinselled trappings in which thou hast bedecked thy Queen, and her royal bantlings." p. 82. "The poor man's family has no right to live, if Victoria's babies be refused a single bauble which they may covet." p. 208. "The nobleman who.....bears the trail [train?] of Mrs. Victoria Guelph." p. 231. "I am overwhelmed? Oh England, thou boasted land of.....pride and extravagance of Victoria." "Dance on, then, in your royal court robes of gilt and satin, and eat what you can of the delicate dainties set before you; but know, that for all this, thou and thy country shall be brought unto judgment." pp. 274, 275. Such are passages occurring in "Ireland as I saw it." Now, we are much mistaken, if any one can animadvert on this phraseology with greater severity than, upon reflection, will Mr. Balch himself. He is an amiable and an honourably-minded man. His feelings are essentially those of a gentleman. He knows as well as we do, that to a lady, whether the Queen of Great Britain, or the wife of the President of the United States—that to a respectable female, be her rank high or low—her sex has always been deemed protection sufficient against language insulting, or capable of being construed into insult. Let it not be said, in vindication of the epithets objected to, that they are to be accounted for, and overlooked, on the score of Mr. Balch's republican feelings and prejudices. That he should prefer a republican to a monarchical form of government, born and educated as he has been, is most natural. That he should feel proud of his connection with the great and glorious commonwealth of which he is a citizen (England herself is proud of having given birth to such a daughter), is at once patriotic and praiseworthy. Indeed, if indifferent to the claims which the United States have on his affections and regard—if disposed to play the part of toady to England's aristocracy, and to laud extravagantly England's institutions to the disparagement of his own, as Washington Irving and Cooper have sometimes exposed themselves to the charge of doing—we should, instead of respecting have cherished contempt for him. But all this is nothing to the purpose. What we want to impress upon our respected friend's mind is, that by becoming a republican, one does not necessarily cease to be a gentleman. There are certain *bienseances* of society which can be cultivated, and can flourish, as well under "the striped star-spangled banner," as under the cross of St. George. Washington, the illustrious countryman of our author, and the commander of a republican army, was one of the best-bred men of his day. And in the persons of other republicans—men in whose breasts the love of freedom, and hatred of tyranny, have glowed bright and strong—have been displayed some of the finest specimens of chivalrous and courteous bearing. At the present moment, what country can vie with the United States—in the respect and deference with which its

citizens treat the fair sex? Why, then, refuse to England—and to England's institutions—the country and the institutions to which the United States owe their being, their liberty and order, and that capacity for onward progress for which they are so remarkable—the tribute of praise which is their due? Why withhold from England's Queen the common courtesies of her sex, not to speak of the peculiar respect to which she is entitled on the score of her personal virtues and exalted station? To a man of Mr. Balch's generous mind and refined feelings, we are sure that we have said enough. From subseqnent editions of his volnme—and many subsequent editions of it may there be—we cannot but persuade onrselves that we shall find the offensive passages expunged.

D. T.

CORRESPONDENCE.

We have received a letter signed P. R. West, containing an extract from S. Richardson, in which he says the heretic Marcion was "the first author of the opinion of the torments of hell never to end." This however is a mistake; as every school-boy knows that it holds a conspicous place in the mythology of the Greeks and Romans, who borrowed it from an Egyptian custom. "The Egyptians," says Rollin, "would not suffer praises to be bestowed indiscriminately on all deceased persons. The honour was to be obtained only from the public voice. The assembly of the judges met on the other side of a lake, which they crossed in a boat. He who sat at the helm was called Charon in the Egyptian language; and this first gave the hint to Orpheus, who had been in Egypt, and after him to other Greeks, to invent the fiction of Charon's boat. As soon as a man was dead he was brought to his trial. The public accuser was heard. If he proved that the deceased had led a bad life, his memory was condemned, and he was deprived of burial. The people were affected by laws which extended even beyond the grave; and every one, struck with the disgrace inflicted on the dead person, was afraid to reflect dishonour on his own memory and that of his family. But if the deceased person was not convicted of any crime, he was interred in an honourable manner." Thus, a national custom, confined to a small locality, was transferred to the unseen world; and thus originated, not only the ferryman Charon, but the three infernal judges, Miros, Rhadamanthus, and Eacus, and the division of Hades into Elysium and Tartarus, the respective abodes of the virtuous and the wicked.—These imaginations were afterwards learned by Jews from their intercourse with Heathens; and the substance of them grafted, with suitable additions and alterations, on the language of Scripture, by them, and by converts from Heathenism, through ignorance of its true meaning. As concerns the Jews, we have abundant proof of this in the Discourse of Josephus on Hades, of which he places the left-hand side so close to "hell itself, to which the wicked will be finally doomed, that they continually hear the noise of it, and do not stand clear of the hot vapour itself." And, as to Heathenized Christianity, which has prevailed ever since, it abounds with descriptions equally vivid and terrific.—Such, to name a few of the most remarkable, are those in Dante's Inferno, and in the writings of Bishop Taylor, Boston, and President Edwards. We have also the pencil vying with the pen on this subject. Even Charon has a place in Michael Angelo's great painting of the Last Judgment; and, in Barry's painting of Elysium and Tartarus, (to be seen at the Adelphi), a thin arch of rock is the only separation between them.

Mr. West will find an account of Tertullian, Marcion, and Pelagius, in Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, second and fifth centuries. Marcion, son to the Bishop of Pontus, was a follower of his cotemporary, Cerdo, a Syrian. They adopted the oriental superstition (afterwards called Manicheism) of two rival deities, a good and an evil, with which they mixed up many extravagancies of their own. The most prominent doctrines of Pelagius related to human liberty and merit; and the controversy between him and Augustin has been renewed in that between Calvinists and Arminians. In fact, every system but one,—that of the pure unmutilated Gospel which we advocate,—is more or less infected with these errors.

The writings of the first ages of Christianity are now scarcely to be seen, except in public libraries, and but few of them have been translated into English. Mr. West need not hesitate to put his reserved questions, as we shall either endeavour to answer them, or to put him in the way of finding answers to them. We are at present unable to say any thing respecting Doctor Fulke.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

THE REV. RIDLEY HERSCHELL, ON THE EXHIBITION OF 1851.

SIR,—From the character of two communications, in your last number, on the subject of Baptism, differing so widely in their view of the subject from each other, I am pleased to infer the catholic and comprehensive nature of that principle which constitutes the characteristic feature of *The Universalist;* and I presume that there is not a periodical which has among its readers so many who hold different opinions. Let us each maintain, and defend on all proper occasions our respective conscientious views of all revealed truth; while we discover, in our manner of avowing those views, that respect, that sympathizing spirit, that forbearance, for brethren who differ from us, which shall prove that we still hold and still breathe the unity of the spirit. *Have we not all one Father?* and though the complexion of our minds slightly differ, though to our finite vision minor and secondary truths appear to one more proximate, and to another more remote, to one more important, and to another comparatively insignificant, is there not "a strong family likeness?" Have we not *one Lord* and Father of all, who is above all, and in all? Have we not *one faith*, who "trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men?" Have we not *one baptism*, which, objectively, is Christ's suffering and death, by which we are all brought nigh to God; and which, subjectively, is our death and burial to the world and the principles of the flesh, and our resurrection in the spirit? This being the case, we can well afford to differ on the subject of literal or symbolic baptism! With all the opposition between the views of your two correspondents, I cannot but believe that the *putting on of* CHRIST is, with them, more than the outward profession of his name; that neither baptism availeth anything, nor un-baptism, but a new creature. The more we profess, and manifest the mind and spirit of Christ, the better Universalists shall we be, and the closer will be our likeness to our Father who is in heaven.

But my object in addressing you was to ask for information respecting a proposition of the Rev. Ridley Herschell. This gentleman, I find, from advertisement, proposes that during the Exhibition of the Industry of all Nations, in the coming year, there shall be a Meeting of all Christians, for the purpose of expressing and manifesting and enforcing the great principle of Christian unity. This object, however, is identical with that of the *Evangelical Alliance*. But this gentleman's proposition does not come through the Evangelical Alliance, but, it would appear, on his own individual responsibility. How is this? Could not the machinery of the Evangelical Alliance be brought into operation far more easily and successfully for the carrying out of Mr. Herschell's proposition? Or is it that the foundation of this organization is not sufficiently broad? Is it that the Rev. Mr. Herschell thinks that there will be more Christians he would like to greet in London next year, than he can get at through the Evangelical Alliance? Can it be that he regards the 8th article of its "doctrinal basis" as ground upon which those Christians who may honour our shores with a visit would receive "*too warm* a reception?" Is Mr. Herschell a member of the Evangelical Alliance? If he is, how is it that he cannot carry out his object through that channel? Is it that he feels unwilling to chop down to their Procrustes' bed, all that he would acknowledge as his brethren in Christ? If so, how can he justify for a moment a connexion which restrains the expression of his Christian brotherhood? But perhaps he is not a member of this Evangelical Alliance: could you inform me whether he holds sentiments sach as you and I advocate? Or at least whether he would acknowledge us as brethren in the Exhibition he proposes to have, or whether, like the Evangelical Alliance. he will say, "I know you not." Fain would I believe that he contemplates something more evangelical, more Christian, more generous; and that no wall of hell-fire will form a barrier to the acknowledgment of those as brethren who entertain with unwavering confidence, on the authority of Scripture, the period when the world shall believe that God sent his Son. The world *will* believe, if Christ's prayer is to be answered: and the oneness of Christ's disciples appears to be connected with, and introductory to, this universal faith. When will the Evangelical Alliance see its inconsisteney? for it maintains the necessity of a manifested unity among Christians, in order to the accomplishment of this event, while it excludes from its association those whom its members allow may be Christians. How can they lift up their hands to God and *pray* that we may all be one, while those very hands are *publicly* refused to those whom they privately acknowledge to be Christians? Trusting you will be able to obtain directly or indirectly Mr. Herschell's views and designs in reference to this matter,

I am, dear Sir,
Yours in the faith,
PHILADELPHOS.

[Being unable to give a direct answer to Philadelphos's concluding inquiry, we publish his letter, hoping that he may obtain it from among our correspondents. But while expressing our inability to give this information, we take the opportunity of observing, that we greatly doubt the efficacy of any public association for the purpose of promoting true Christian unity. We may waive our differences, but this is not unity of spirit. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God; and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness;" and if, among these things, we attempt to draw a line of demarkation between what we do or do not consider essential, we may detract from that *perfection* which it is given to promote. "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." "Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that which he alloweth." But if, going beyond this, we associate with a multitude of whose particular views we know nothing, we may substitute indifferenee for unity. The Bible-taught Christian will beware of extremes: he will encourage free inquiry, while he stands aloof both from the dogmatist and latitudinarian.—ED.]

THE UNIVERSALIST.

DECEMBER, 1850.

TRUE CHRISTIANITY A PRACTICAL RELIGION.

ARTICLE V. CONCLUSION.

HAVING animadverted upon the causes which tend to counteract the practical tendencies of Christian principles, and found that they lie not in these principles themselves but in the errors and perversions of those who profess them, we shall now direct our attention to the consideration of the way in which these principles ought to be exhibited and enforced, so as to vindicate the truth of the position with which we set out,—that true Christianity is a practical religion.

God has not revealed himself to man as a mere object of intellectual apprehension or abstract speculation. His revelations have uniformly been of such a character as to interest man's feelings and supply him with motives to action. His first revelation was essentially so, for it was accompanied and connected with a command, on the observance of which man's happiness, nay, his very existence depended. And, to this day, this is the view of the Divine character most open to human comprehension, and which men have no difficulty in receiving. But it is different with the last and fullest revelation of his character, in which many or most of mankind appear to see no practical tendency whatever. A command with accompanying promise or threat is perfectly adapted to a selfish and conditionalizing creature, and its practical tendency is at once seen and acknowledged; but a declaration of unconditional love is so completely opposed to the constitution of his mind, that he can see no practical tendency in it, and either rejects it altogether as unworthy of its author, or perverts it, under a profession of receiving it, into what, though he may call it grace, is in reality law. Only those in whose hearts God hath shined to give them the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ feel its practical tendency; they love God because they know that he hath first loved them, and by this love they are constrained to live not in the flesh to the lusts of men but to the will of God.

When God declared himself to Abram (Gen. xvii. 1)—that he was the Almighty God, it was with an exhortation to him to walk before him and be perfect; when again he revealed himself to Moses as *Jehovah*, no longer as simply the Almighty God but as the *I am* or ever present God, it was to remind the children of Israel that it was he

who was the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob, who had made promises to their fathers which he was now about to fulfil, by redeeming them out of Egypt and taking them to be a people to himself to serve him. (Exod. iii. 11—17; vi. 1—8.) When he spoke to Israel by the prophets it was to command them to act in his service, to reproach them for their ingratitude and threaten them for their disobedience, or to comfort them with prospects of deliverance from their degradation. There was nothing in such communications of a merely speculative character; all were adapted to produce an effect upon their feelings and a corresponding practical influence on their conduct.

His revelation of himself in the work of Jesus Christ is eminently of this character to those who believe in it, however otherwise it may appear to those who discredit or pervert it. It is calculated to move their feelings and influence their conduct, and the scriptures which make it known also record precepts intended to guide them in the way they should walk. Commands and threats constitute no essential part of the glad tidings of the mercy of God: as indicating the certain consequences of our actions they suggest hopes and fears of reward or punishment, and are not superseded by Christianity: they remain as before; but as the highest motives to action they are now superseded by admonition and exhortation. The believer is not now called upon to act in a particular manner by promises or threats of what God may do to him, but he is admonished or kept in mind of what God has done and will do for him, and exhorted to act in a manner becoming that knowledge.

It is true that the Divine nature needs no admonition; its inherent tendency is to love, for God is love. It is true that the Spirit of Christ requires no exhortation, for its essential fruits are love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance. But it is ever to be kept in mind, that, while on earth, believers like other men are creatures of flesh and blood, possessed of that mind which is enmity against God. And there is perhaps no error more pernicious than keeping this out of view, in addressing professed believers as purely spiritual beings or as persons possessed only of the mind of Christ, the result of which is often the production of the most unchristian self-complacency combined with the lowest moral degradation. Men are spiritual or influenced by the spirit of Christ only so far as they are kept believing the testimony which reveals God's mercy in Christ, and whenever they forget this they are simply human beings, liable to fall into any crime ever so repugnant to the expressed will of God. This forgetfulness they are ever prone to, and hence the necessity for continual admonition. They are partakers of the Divine nature only so far as they are believers in those exceeding great and precious promises by which that nature is communicated, and whenever they doubt the truth of these, they are liable to manifest ever so much distrust in the word of God and preference of their own ways; and hence the necessity for constant exhortation. There is another error, equally, if not even still more mischievous, that of treating professors as if they had two distinct capacities in which they might act independently of each other, a kind of procedure calculated to produce similar effects to those we

have just noticed. Instead of this, their carnal propensities or natural desires are to be kept under subjection and controlled by their spiritual principles; for they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.

In accordance with these things the apostolic epistles abound in admonition and exhortation. The writers recognize no such double capacity or two-fold individuality as that we have just noticed; they never charge their hearers to do one thing in one capacity, and instruct or even permit them to do another and opposite thing in another capacity. Instead of that they exhort them "to put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof." (Rom. xiii. 14.) Or again, after many reproaches, warnings and instructions, they wind up with such expressions as these,—"For ye are not your own, ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit which are God's." "Ye are bought with a price, be not ye servants of men." Thus Paul instructs Timothy to put his hearers in remembrance of the consequences of the death and life of Christ, "charging them before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers." Thus again Peter after some practical exhortations to those he addresses, in his second epistle says,—"Wherefore I will not be negligent to put you always in remembrance of these things, though ye know them, and be established in the present truth."

Nor are warnings a wanting, warnings against supposing that a mere profession of belief is belief, or that believers may neglect the counsels and instructions of their Heavenly Father with impunity. The Lord Jesus himself warned his disciples thus, "Not every one that saith to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." We have the same sentiment reiterated by his apostles, as in the words of John, "If a man say I love God and hateth his brother he is a liar." We have the statement repeated in different forms and without any reservation—that every man shall be rewarded according as his work shall be. And we have such words as these addressed by an inspired apostle to his brethren, "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap;" or such admonitions as these, "Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear; For our God is a consuming fire;" or as it has been rendered, "we having received a kingdom not to be shaken, let us hold fast a gift whereby we can worship God acceptably, with reverence and religious fear. For even our God is a consuming fire." (Macknight.)

It is well worthy of remark that there is in the apostolic writings no dissociation of doctrinal teaching and practical instruction; in the very epistles in which doctrinal points are treated of at length, and salvation by grace vindicated against the perversions of Judaizing teachers, the inspired writers do not fail to instruct and exhort upon the conduct becoming believers. There is no satisfaction with the exposition of true principles to warrant them in neglecting the inculcation of precepts by which these are to be regulated; no fear of producing pharisaical feelings to deter them from practical exhortation respecting this, or induce

them to speak of it in a depreciating manner; no doubt or hesitation respecting a standard of right, no reference to the conduct of others to cause them to avoid or neglect it. Paul, for instance, writes to the saints at Ephesus, speaks to them of the redemption in Christ according to the will of God, tells them that they are saved by grace and that not of themselves for it is the gift of God, shews them that Christ Jesus is their peace having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; and then without any fear of counteracting the effect of what he has said, goes on to beseech them to walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they are called, and gives them specific instructions as to how this is to be done. In his epistle to the Romans which is principally occupied in vindicating the sovereignty and grace of God, he does not hesitate to give practical exhortations, and appears to have no fear of producing phariseeism by so doing. Those therefore who urge such excuses for the neglect of practical teaching are obviously acting in direct opposition to apostolic example.

Believers ought ever to keep in mind that they are called on to glorify God in all that they do;—whether they eat or drink or whatsoever they do, to do all to the glory of God;—to let their light so shine before men that they may see their good works and glorify their father which is in heaven. This is the principle by which all who profess the gospel ought to be actuated,—that by which all who really believe it in its purity and simplicity *are* actuated; and when we find professed disciples of Christ not apparently actuated by it as their paramount motive, we have reason to fear that they hold a perverted gospel or are grossly ignorant of their vocation. It may be true that there are many, very many, who profess to act upon such principles, in whom it is manifest that their religion is not the gospel of the grace of God, but some pharisaical or self-righteous sentiments, some system of self-delusion cloaked with the profession of rhe religion of Jesus Christ; it may be true that there are some professing the gospel, against whose creed no decided objection can be brought, but whose conduct is not marked by such consistency as we might look for; it may be true that there are many, who, observing these things, in order to avoid such inconsistencies make no religious profession at all, but standing in what they consider a safe, and we would also add a cowardly position, sneer and scoff at the hypocrises and inconsistencies of others; and it may be true that believers of the gospel really having such principles before them will always be more or less inconsistent, inasmuch as imperfection is the inseparable characteristic of humanity, that such by following their own ways instead of minding the things of God will too often manifest the existence in them of that mind of flesh which is enmity to God. All these things may be and are true, yet they ought not to deter the disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ from holding his word as their standard of conduct, and from asserting by word and deed its paramount claims upon all who profess to be his followers.

It is their business, and if their eyes be not blinded they will see it to be their high and glorious privilege, to do so with a single eye to the glory of God, and without any reference to the opinions or practice of other men. If any strive after or attain to a more than ordinary

observance of the precepts of Jesus upon self-righteous principles, it should be their business to emulate or surpass them upon true principles. If some profess principles apparently true but act inconsistently it should be their business to take warning and avoid such causes of reproach. If many to avoid such inconsistencies, act, either avowedly or not, upon no higher standard than a mere conformity to the world, it should be their business to endeavour to shew such that they can act as consistently with their high standard (externally at least, and that is all such people know or care for) as these can do with their low and grovelling one. And when they lose sight of their standard or fail in their observance of it, it should then be for them to remember that they are thereby dishonouring the name of their Divine teacher and bringing a reproach upon his cause.

Not that the most consistent conduct will always command the approbation and respect of the world. In its eyes many things which are or ought to be respected by the believer will appear quite unnecessary, and attention to them will only be considered fanatical or absurd. But it ought to be remembered, as it is a thing too frequently forgotten or not attended to, that the highest degree of respectability amongst the religious or well conducted part of the community, the greatest freedom from acknowledged vices and immoralities, the most kind and gentle deportment, nay even the most active benevolence, do not necessarily spring from Christian principle. It will certainly produce such results to a greater or less extent, and is indeed, directly or indirectly, the principal means of producing them, but they all may exist in a very high degree, in an individual unacquainted with the gospel of the grace of God; natural constitution, education, circumstances, and selfish or self-righteous principles may produce such characteristics, and individuals exhibiting them may deservedly gain the approbation and esteem of their fellow men. But Christian principle is especially indicated by its producing reverence for the word of God as such, with a corresponding attention to its indications, entirely irrespective of either the approbation or disapprobation of the world. "What saith the Lord?" is the question of him who puts his trust in God; and in giving his attention to this and acting upon it, he is at once glorifying God, and, however otherwise it may appear to men, pursuing the course best adapted for his own good, being that pointed out by Him who causeth all things to work together for good to them that love him.

And it ought to be constantly kept in mind that reverence for the word of God is not best evinced by words; there may be ever so much ability to speak of the dealings of God with man and ever so great profession of devout sentiments towards God, accompanied with a kind of conduct at variance with such professions. Without consistency between profession and practice their can be no evidence of the reality and sincerity of a profession. Mankind have always recognized this and have embodied it in the proverbial form, that example is better than precept. And it is not only most important in affording evidence of the sincerity of any individual's profession, but is equally important to his success in communicating his principles to others. For if men observe that there is little consistency between a man's practice and

profession, they will naturally feel indifferent to what he says, as he contradicts by deeds what he professes in words; if on the other hand he be distinguished by consistency, their attention will be directed to the teacher as one who really believes what he professes and to his subject as one likely to be of importance. Hence, so far as human agency is concerned, there will be greater probability of success in his endeavours to communicate his principles to others.

In nothing is consistency more necessary in the believer than in matters purely connected with religion. In morals there may be as great consistency between the profession and practice of an unbeliever as of a Christian. It is in things connected with his faith that it is of special importance that consistency ought to be exhibited by the disciple of Jesus,—things which may be deemed by the world unimportant. If he believe that eternal life is God's unconditional gift to him, it ought to be his business to avoid saying or doing anything that would imply a belief or admission that it was conditional. If he maintain the simplicity and purity of the Apostolic gospel in opposition to its popular perversions, it ought to be his business to avoid conducting himself in any way that would lead men to suppose that the difference was unimportant. If he assert the unscriptural nature of the religious associations professing to be churches of Christ or the hollowness of the pretensions of their heads and leaders, it ought to be his business to take care that he do nothing that might lead men to suppose that he in any way recognizes the claims of the one, or imitates even in appearance the pretensions of the other. If he repudiate the latitudinarianism that sacrifices truth to a spurious liberality, it ought to be his business carefully to discriminate and to maintain the paramount claims of truth, even at the risk of the easily made charge of bigotry and fanaticism. These things are too little attended to;—so little as to indicate gross ignorance of the conduct becoming the disciples of Christ, and a necessity for attention being more specifically directed towards them. But so long as they are neglected, whether from ignorance of them or unwillingness to attend to them, the cause of truth will inevitably suffer.

We do not wish to conceal that the course becoming the Christian is not a path of roses. The religion of Jesus is one of peace and good will to men, but it is not a peace to be sought or obtained by the sacrifice of truth. The disciple of Christ is represented as a soldier armed for battle; "the weapons of his warfare are not carnal but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds; casting down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." He must be armed with the sword of the Spirit which is the word of God, and with the shield of faith. His only aim ought to be his Master's glory, his great reward his Lord's approbation. Self as an aim ought to be entirely dismissed, and that this might not be too hard for a being necessarily selfish, he has this gracious assurance, that while the glory of God is his object his own happiness will be the result. In his course he will meet much to discourage him,—the indifference of those who by profession ought to be his supporters and assistants, the sneers and ridicule of his

opponents, the ungenerous suspicions and illiberal interpretations of those who having no principle themselves cannot comprehend its influence upon others. And more than all these, he will have his own weakness, his own selfish propensities to lead him to faint in his course and to waver in his path.

Yet ought he not to be discouraged by all these things. For he knows that if foes oppose him he has the Lord of Hosts upon his side to support him; if the ignorant suspect him he has the Holy Spirit of promise to comfort him; if friends neglect him he has one friend who "sticketh closer than a brother;" if he fail under trials he has one who is faithful and just to forgive him and to cleanse him from all unrighteousness. He need not murmur at sufferings for his master's sake, for he knows that many of his fellow creatures have suffered as much or more, who never knew the living and true God and had no good hope to support them. Nay he has been exhorted to rejoice under sufferings for Christ's sake and promised a great reward in heaven.

Such are the practical sanctions of Christianity, sanctions and motives which none but those who know and believe the true gospel of the grace of God can understand and appreciate. They are purely generous, springing from a generous principle; those therefore who directly or indirectly see in the New Testament Dispensation anything to be done by the creature in order to procure or to satisfy himself that he will obtain eternal life, must consider them insufficient: with such we cannot argue respecting their sufficiency; we can only appeal to the record to vindicate the freeness and fulness of the mercy of God there revealed; those who believe this gospel feel them to be sufficient, and all who profess to believe it ought to take care that they give no good reason to others to doubt their sufficiency.

We have thus vindicated, as we have been able, the claims of Christianity to be considered a practical religion, and endeavoured to shew, that if ever it appears otherwise, either the actuating principles spring from perversion of the gospel, or the fault lies not in the gospel but in the ignorance or selfish propensities of those who profess it. This was our object in commencing this series of papers, and therefore here we now bring them to a conclusion. Yet we have spoken only of those effects which come under the cognizance of others and respecting which they can form a judgment, and have passed over another class not less real and not less important known only in the experience of individual believers; and these the peace, love and joy which the knowledge of God's character communicated by the gospel imparts; the knowledge of God as love, which amidst a scene where so much trouble and grief and misery mix with the displays of God's beneficence and wisdom, enables them to contemplate the ulterior development of the Divine purposes with something better than philosophic calmness; enables them to look forward with joyful anticipation to a period when every thing which now veils the view of the wisdom and beneficence of the Almighty shall be withdrawn, and the works of the evil one being destroyed, God shall be manifested not only as their Father, but as the Great Father of all.

D. W.

THE DOCTRINE OF ENDLESS MISERY IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The doctrine of endless misery is not inculcated in the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, although it may be inferred from an expression in the Athanasian Creed. Originally, when the Articles numbered *forty-two*, there was a special condemnation of those who held to the final salvation of all men. As follows:

Article XLII. All men not to be saved at last. 'They also deserve to be condemned, who endeavour to restore that pernicious opinion, that all men (tho' never so ungodly) shall at last be saved; when for a certain time appointed by the Divine Justice, they have endured punishment for their sins committed.'

These Articles were revised in the time of Elizabeth, and the 42nd with one or two others was cutoff. From the time of the revision of the Articles, it has not been considered an offence, in the Church of England, to avow the doctrine of Universal Salvation. Some of her most eminent divines have maintained it, without incurring any displeasure or disability on that account. And perhaps there have been furnished as spirited arguments on both sides of this question by members and divines of the English Church, as the world has ever seen. 'It is owing to the moderation of our Church,' says Dr. Hey who seems himself to be in great doubt as to the truth of endless misery, 'that we are not called upon to subscribe to the eternity of hell torments: nay, we are not required even to condemn those who presume to affirm that all men will be finally saved.'

On the subject of endless misery, we find all shades of opinion in the Church of England. Some of the brightest luminaries of that Church, have denounced the doctrine, and defended that of the final holiness and happiness of all men. At the present day, it ls no heresy in that Church, for a man to defend that doctrine. Even in cases where the doctrine is held, it seems in many of them, to be merely a formal profession, rather than a real faith. A writer in the Westminster Review, for April last, speaks on this subject, and seeks to show, that the churchman thinks little of the doctrine of endless torture, even if he professes to believe it. We know not by whom the article was written. The writer seems to regard the National Church, as a huge institution, more to be prized for its convenience, than for any favourable effect it has on religion or virtue. He says—

In their mismanagement—as ever happens when prophecy is dead and priesthood lives—Christianity becomes *a threat*; 'if you do not use our magic and believe our mysteries, 'without doubt you shall perish everlastingly." Nor is this the accidental feature of some one school of theology; it is a common character in the teachings of Tractarian and of Evangelical, who may quarrel about the means of grace, but can shake hands over the eternal wrath. From this the whole economy which they profess to administer is nothing but a contrivance for escape.—This is the fundamental postulate from which the

whole scheme is developed, which dictates all its language and gives meaning to all its forms. The charming away of this infinite curse is the very problem which the Church proposes to solve, and which is held to justify her existence. She is not there to make good citizens and good men, to give sanctity to the laws of obligation, and hope to sorrow and pure affection; but distinctly to wash out of them a physical poison, and save them from the tortures of an inexhaustible vengeance. And this tremendous end she refuses to accomplish, except on conditions, which the wisest may be unable to trust, and the most faithful may scruple to accept. For who can say that goodness may not doubt the sacraments which Clarkson and Elizabeth Fry disowned, and purity of heart reject the dogmas which Arnold and Channing never held? Either what the Church insists on as essential are not essentials, and her commission to dispense them comes to nought; or some of the best of men and most saintly of women are among the damned. We question whether any one, professing such a fable as this, is to be believed upon his own word. He professes a psychological impossibility. No man, who would hesitate to put Channing on the wheel, and object to burn Mrs. Fry, feeling that his reluctance comes from a good heart, can believe that God will do these things on a scale more terrible.

It requires indeed no great insight into character to discover, that any reality in this eternal curse and penalty has for some time ceased. In proposing to rescue men from it, the church makes an offer which no one cares to accept. Have our lay readers ever practically met with a person—not under remorse for actual and heinous sin—who wanted to be delivered from eternal torment? If ever a man does really apprehend such a thing for himself, and wring his hands and fix is eye in wild despair, how do we deal with him? Do we praise the clearness of his moral diagnosis and logic of his orthodoxy? do we refer him to the font for baptism, or the keys for absolution? No, we send him to the physician rather than to the priest; we put cold sponges on his head, and bid his friends look after him. Nor does his doctrine any better bear application to the persons around us than to ourselves. If we sometimes act and speak by it, we never feel and rarely think by it. Who ever knew a mother despair of her unbaptized and departed child? Let it only be considered *what* is the scene, what is the perspective, before her imagination, if she be at once sound and sincere in the faith; and it must be owned that even her most passionate grief never rises to the pitch of such piercing shrieks as she would hurl into the place of unutterable agony. The whole conduct and demeanour of the very persons who defend this doctrine afford the clearest proof that it is incredible. The late Dr. Hamilton, of Leeds, wrote a book to prove that beyond the little circle of choice believers, the universe is a vast torture chamber; and yet a merrier laugh, a more exuberant wit, a greater geniality, was rarely ever to be found. The professional hours of his life were spent, like those of some old painters, in colouring lurid pictures of his neighbours clutched by devils, and the world in general swallowing hot pitch; and for the rest of his time he was free to dine with the reprobates, and crack his jokes with the damned. No one, who seriously considers the intense inconsistency involved in such a life, can suppose that the theologian really held a faith which the grasp of a friendly hand and the welcome on a familiar face sufficed to dissipate. It is the same throughout the whole class of the sincerest and most faithful Christians.—They delude themselves with the mere fancy and image of a belief. The death of a friend who departs from life in heresy affects them, precisely in the same way as the loss of another whose creed was unimpeachable; while the theoretic difference is infinite, the practical is virtually nothing perhaps a sign of acquiescence in the clergyman's official compassion, or a faint desire that it had been otherwise; but not half the distress which had been felt when the same friend had broken his leg and lost his Pennsylvania dividends. What room, indeed could there be for the business, the amusements, the contests of this world, if it reflected from every salient point the red light of so horrible a background? Who could spare any attention for the vicissitudes of

cotton and the price of shares, for the merits of the last opera, and the bets upon the next election, if the actors in these things were really swinging in his eye over such a verge as he affects to see? We would ask any clergyman who reads the Athanasian creed—How can you transact your daily affairs with any peace of mind? Your coat was made by a man who doubts the co-eternity; your grocer thinks the Holy Ghost created; you pay your rent to a landlord who confounds the persons; and your fishmonger divides the substance. If you found any of these with his house on fire, you would not think it a time for prosecuting your business: you see him in a greater peril, and you coolly inquire about sugars, or discuss the choice of salmon! The misfortune is, this doctrine is in some degree protected by its own monstrous character; which takes it so sheer out of all nature, that it can scarcely be confronted with reality. If we apply it to such tests of experience as would suffice in other cases, we produce results whose startling look distracts the attention from their logical consequentiality; and when we demand from men a life in simple accordance with their profession, the thing itself is so impossible that we are apt to seem unreasonable, and become charged with the very extravagance which we impute. It is, however' notorious that a large number, even of the clergy, are fully *conscious* of their unbelief in this doctrine; and among the educated laity, the impression is general that no one, except here and there a dull curate or a pugnacious bishop, is sincere in his assent to it.—Will it not then be got rid of? Not a bit: the instinct of ecclesiastical cohesion, and the passion for nominal unity, will outweigh all sense of human veracity and reverence for godly simplicity; and year after year, as sure as the Athanasian festivals come round thousands of clergymen will solemnly profess, before tens of thousands of assenting people, a creed which is fatal to the heart of all. Depend upon it the State will wake up to a sense of right and dignity in this matter before the Church; and the honour of politicians grow sensitive to the blot, while yet, the conscience of divines could bear a longer shame.

ON BEING WISE ABOVE WHAT IS WRITTEN.

From the Christian Examiner, for March, 1835.

There is nothing which, in my mind, has done more discredit to religion, and tended more to mar its symmetry and beauty, than the vain attempts which the lovers of system make to add to that which wants no addition, and to improve that which is incapable of improvement. Thus, in order as it were, to enhance the goodness of God, we are often told that it would have been in full consistence with his justice to have left all mankind to perish in the iniquity of Adam. Now, in the first place, where is this revealed? And, in the next place, what does it mean? Does it mean that such a procedure would be consistent with any justice intelligible to us? Or that our understandings are so formed, that we can conceive the justice of constituting one man the representative of countless millions, yet unconscious and unborn; and, because he disobeyed, predestinating them to eternal misery, and creating them in successive generations as inheritors of that curse? But if it be said, "Who art thou, O man, that repliest against God?" I answer, Nay, who art thou that attributest to God that which he has not revealed of himself, and thereby defeatest the great object of the Scriptures, namely, to set before us the *true character of God?* To say that God could, in consistency with his nature, have pursued a different course from the one he did pursue respecting man is, I repeat it, to give a different character of God from that revealed in Scripture. Such representations amount, in fact, to this—that the adorable goodness which God's mercies in Christ Jesus display is merely a history of the manner in which he was pleased to act towards us, and is not a development of that which is essential and unchangeable in the temper and constitution of his mind and nature. I will endeavour to illustrate my meaning by the following supposition:—A fellow-creature has, in some given instance, acted towards me with unparalleled

kindness and generosity. This conduct naturally produces in my mind not only a deep sense of obligation, but the highest admiration of his disposition and character. Now, would not this latter impression be diminished rather than increased, were I to give credit to the testimony of one who thus addressed me —"You may indeed rejoice in the benefits you have received; for such is the character of your benefactor, that he is quite capable of acting in a far different manner?" Such a belief might, indeed, enhance to me the value of my own good fortune; but it could not but lessen the admiration and esteem which I had before experienced. H. W.

POETRY.

Oh yet we trust that somehow good
Will be the final goal of ill,
To pangs of nature, sins of will,
Defects of doubt, and taints of blood;

That nothing walks with aimless feet;
That not one life shall be destroy'd,
Or cast as rubbish to the void,
When God hath made the pile complete;

That not a worm is cloven in vain;
That not a moth with vain desire
Is shrivel'd in a fruitless fire,
Or but subserves another's gain.

Behold, we know not anything;
I can but trust that good shall fall
At last—far off—at last, to all,
And every winter change to spring.

So runs my dream: but what am I?
An infant crying in the night:
An infant crying for the light:
And with no language but a cry.

TENNYSON.

REVIEWS.

The Millennium. By GEORGE GALLOWAY, Glasgow. Dunfermline: W. Clark. London: H. K. Lewis. Glasgow: Colville and Co. 1850.

GEORGE GALLOWAY is no ordinary man. Born in obscurity, and environed with difficulties of almost every kind, he has nevertheless contrived to turn his education, such as it is, to profitable account, and to take a respectable place among the theological writers of his day and country. As an advocate for the Universality of God's love to man, he has been able and unflinching.

Within a very few years, there have issued from his pen, "The Errors of Modern Theology," "The truth triumphant," "An address to Universalists," "The Woman in the Wilderness," and "Dialogues on future punishment by W. G. Moncrieff, reviewed," besides the work now awaiting our critical award. There is, it seems, now in his hands, nearly ready for publication, "The light of faith," also. Truly, talent, industry, and an overweening desire to promote the welfare of his fellow men, are qualities which cannot by any one be denied to our author.

There is, when we come to reflect on it, something curious in the fact of particular departments of the mechanical arts giving birth, from time to time, to groups of individuals of high and decided genius, who, in spite of every obstacle, have climbed the steep hill of fame, and fixed on themselves and their writings, the attention, not only of their contemporaries, but of posterity. Towards the end of the last, and during the early portion of the present century, the worshipful fraternity of shoemakers, could boast of having shed on the literary world in England, the light of a Gifford and a Bloomfield—men with whose names "the Quarterly Review,"* and "the Farmer's Boy" are imperishably associated. Nearer to our own day—indeed, one of the parties being still numbered among our living luminaries—two men, Allan Cunning-

* Gifford was likewise author of the "Baviad and Mæviad," and other poems. His bitter and spiteful articles in the "Quarterly," especially his savage attack on poor young Keats, the poet, have contributed to render somewhat problematical the claims of his old profession to be styled "the gentle craft."

ham and Hugh Miller, one, a poet, and the other, a geologist, one the author of the "Life of Burns," and the other of "The old red Sandstone," both originally operative masons, have arisen to adorn their profession, excite the admiration of the reading public, and be added to that bright galaxy of talent, of which the northern portion of our island has such just reason to be proud. To these eminent stone-cutters, who by dint of genius and attainments have hewn out to themselves a pathway to fame and literary immortality, may we be allowed to add, as *quamvis longo intervallo* not unworthy of the association, the name of George Galloway.

We are well aware that George's celebrity, when compared with that of the men just alluded to, is circumscribed and local—that theology is not exactly the department of knowledge on which high and lasting reputations are generally built up—and that in point of genius, that undefined and undefinable power which invests with magic splendour, and with hues peculiarly its own, whatever it touches, he is decidedly inferior. Indeed, the idea of putting him, on anything like a footing of equality with those who, conventionally speaking, are the subjects of the muse's choicest inspirations, is one which, if cherished and carried into effect, our worthy friend, with that sound manly sense, and straightforwardness of character, for which he is so remarkable, would reject at once with indignation and scorn. But he has decided claims on our attention, notwithstanding. We question much if, as regards shrewdness and sagacity—clearness of apprehension—the faculty of abstract thinking—logical precision of statement and inference—and general strength of intellect, he be much, if at all, behind the ablest of his masonic brethren. His reading, we suspect, has been limited. His opportunities for the quiet observation of nature, and for private and undisturbed meditation, pressed on as he has been by the demands of a laborious profession, and obliged to work for his daily bread, must have been but "few and far between." Our astonishment is, that, situated as he has been, he should have able to write so much, and to write so well.

Confining ourselves at present to the notice of his "Millennium," we may be allowed to say generally, that with respect to literary ability it fully sustains his reputation. The same perspicuity of thought and statement, the same nervous and pointed although simple phraseology, and the same masculine energy of character are apparent in this, as in his former productions. Perhaps the style is somewhat jejune. We may desiderate a little more variety of language. And occasionally we encounter repetitions of the same sentiment. But whether possessed of the ability for it or not, our friend has no time for polish. And repetitions, besides being unavoidable by one in his position, are from the nature of his subject, indispensable to his being distinctly and thoroughly understood. Repetitions are not always to be regarded as blemishes. In our author's treatises they are never offensive.

The great matter which in Mr. Galloway as in any other writer on the subject of religion, arouses and fixes our attention, is not how he says, but what he says. Does he speak according to the revealed mind of God? is almost our sole question. If satisfied on this point, we can pass over many deficiencies. If, on the contrary, dissatisfied, the author may unite to the profound and philosophical reflections of a Burke, the easy elegance and nameless graces of a Cowper, without in the slightest degree dazzling our eyes, or blinding us to the radical defect which pervades his composition.

Our friend, considered as a theologian, has hitherto by all his writings, and now especially by his "Millennium," excited in our mind a mixed feeling of approbation and regret. As ourselves Universalists, details apart, we cannot but coincide with him. As opposed to attempts to undeify the Lord Jesus, and raise the guilty dying nature of man to his throne, he has our warm and hearty sympathies. As desirous of maintaining that faith is a practical principle, working by love, opposed to all licentiousness, and producing fruits and effects corresponding to itself, to say that he carries us along with him, is to say little, for, what is infinitely better, he has the scriptures on his side, and may set

human criticism at defiance. It is in regard to other points, and these important ones, that he seems to us to be mistaken. And on the principle of *speaking the truth in love*, we would now take leave respectfully to direct his attention, as well as that of our readers, to them.

But, first of all, it is due to Mr. Galloway to state, that he has written us a note, requesting, in the event of our reviewing his work, and explaining our own sentiments in opposition to his, the insertion of a letter forwarded to us, at the same time. Compliments to ourselves suppressed, we can have no objection to do so. The letter is ably and succinctly written; and the nature of its contents may serve to simplify the grounds of controversy between our respected friend and ourselves.

"We both believe," he thus proceeds, "that it is not in a righteousness of our own, but in the divine righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ, God manifested, that we must stand approved before God: but then we do not see eye to eye regarding the meaning of this. I believe that our being clothed upon with the divine righteousness of Christ, is not an antinomian fiction, but a reality to be known in our conscience and experience. I believe that Christ's righteousness must be upon us, and in us, in the same way that it was upon and in himself, before we can be justified before God. You, if I understand you, have a notion that Christ's righteousness is to be *imputed* or *ascribed* to us for our justification, while in ourselves we are nothing but Godless sinners. —Again: I do not know what you mean when you say, that a participation in the divine nature lifts us up *above the law*. In one sense, the divine nature places us above the law, after being made partakers of God's nature. God's law then ceases to be a bondage to us. It then becomes the law of our being. But we are not then elevated above being under obligation to fulfil the law. We are not then discharged from being under obligation to love God with all our hearts and our neighbours as ourselves; we are rather made capable of doing this."

Had we been left to ourselves, and allowed to take our own way, our mode of reviewing "the Millennium," would have been at once to consider his leading ideas on the subject of our Lord's personal reign. But as our author has prescribed or perhaps rather suggested the course which would be most agreeable to himself, we shall follow it. Before, therefore, uttering a word directly as to his millennial sentiments, or expressing our agreement or disagreement with them, we shall advert and reply to his two queries: in so doing, actually although not formally, criticising much of his work; and leaving himself and his readers to apply our remarks particularly to such passages and phrases as we deem unscriptural, inconsistent, or defective.

First. Our friend professes to agree with us, in maintaining, that the righteousness of Jesus Christ alone, perfected and consummated in his atoning sacrifice is that clothed with which guilty creatures stand accepted before God. But he labours under two mistakes: one, respecting our views; and another, involved in his own.—He mistakes us. We do not as he fancies, suppose the one righteousness of Christ to be separated, or separable from his divine nature, any more than we suppose Adam's one sin to be separated, or separable from his human nature. It is not arbitrarily, or by imputation merely, but as one with Adam, and as inheriting his nature, that his one sin, as the sin of his nature, is imputed to human beings. That sin, is the only sin which brought in death. Rom. v. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 22; and death having attached to the nature which committed it as having shewn itself sinful in Adam, attaches to the same nature as sinful in all his posterity. They are one with him, because they were seminally in him, when he committed the one transgression. See Heb. vii. 10. Hence, the death of infants. We crush a brood of newly hatched serpents, not because they have done or are as yet capable of doing any mischief, but on account, of their nature, as manifested in other serpents by overt acts; so does God inflict death on infants, not as having committed, or as capable of committing actual transgression, but on account of their nature as manifested in the one overt act of transgression committed by

Adam. On precisely the same ground of their inheriting and possessing Adam's nature, and not on the ground of personal offences, is death inflicted on adults. Therefore death which is *sin's wages*, and is inflicted solely as the punishment of the one sin committed by Adam never is, and never can be disjoined from the nature from which that one sin emanated. Just so with the righteousness of Jesus Christ. It is not arbitrarily or by imputation merely, but as one with Christ, and as inheriting his nature, that his one righteousness, as the righteousness of his nature, is imputed to any one. This righteousness is what alone brings in life everlasting; Phil. ii. 8, 9; and life everlasting having become attached to the nature of Christ glorified, as the nature of him by whom it was performed, attaches to that same nature whenever and wherever it is to be met with. To confine ourselves, for brevity's sake to the case of the Church. Viewed as human beings, righteousness is the privilege of every member of that body by imputation only. Rom. iv. 3—8. For in Adam, and as inheriting his nature, they are, and only can be unrighteous and ungodly. Hence, even in believers, *the body*, (or they themselves as one with Adam,) *is dead because of sin.* Rom. viii. 10. But in reality Christ's one righteousness is theirs by more than imputation. It is theirs in fact. It is theirs in enjoyment. And this by the indwelling in them while on earth, in earnest, and hereafter, fully, of the divine nature. For from the divine nature, Christ's one righteousness is inseparable.* Therefore, it is through *faith, which is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen*—through *faith which worketh by love—as of the operation of God*, and the earnest in us of God's nature, and in no other way, that the one righteousness of Christ can become ours. Heb. xi. 1, 6. Possessed of that principle, we are possessed of that mind of Christ glorified, without which none can belong to him. Rom. viii. 9. What is in itself divine testimony, becomes through faith divine testimony to us.† That righteousness of Jesus Christ which *objectively* is *to all*, becomes *subjectively*, through faith, *upon all them that believe.* Rom. iii. 22. The one divine righteousness of Jesus Christ therefore, being, while this present world lasts, and while the members of the church are in flesh, as inseparable from faith, the earnest of the divine nature, as the one sin of Adam is inseparable from human nature, our friend unintentionally does us injustice, in the abridged representation which, in the above letter, he has given of our sentiments.—Mr. Galloway's other mistake respects his own theory. Like the general run of theologians, he confounds the state of Christ in flesh, with the state of Christ in Spirit. The two states, however, it is manifest from scripture, especially from the sixth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, are essentially different. While our blessed Lord was incarnate and on earth, he was subject to law, (Gal. iv. 4,) bearing sin, (the sins of others, not his own, Isaiah liii. 5, 6, 1 Peter ii. 24, 2 Cor. v. 21, Psalm xxxii. 5, li. 1—5,) and under obligation to die. John x. 18. But seated on the throne of his glory, he appears as having ended and swallowed up law in his own divine righteousness, Rom. x. 4, as having *put away sin by the sacrifice of himself*, Heb. ix. 26, and as having risen from the dead, *to die no more, death having no more dominion over him.* Rom. vi. 9‡ These two states, the one, of Christ in flesh, and the other of Christ in spirit, are unquestionably two states of one and the same divine person. But they are distinct states, notwithstanding. The one, connected with

---

* Righteousness, as connected with Christ's human nature, was abstinence from evil, or the *negative* merely (Psalm xxvi. 6); righteousness, as connected with the divine nature of our Lord, or his present nature, consists in the sacrifice of his human nature, as pure and perfect, or the *positive* (Phil. ii. 8). Both were essential to his being the saviour. The former, however, was performed in subserviency to the latter; the former having been temporary, the latter, everlasting. Rev. v. throughout.

† See the Greek of Hebrews xi. 2, and 39. Serious is the mistake into which our translation is calculated to lead the mere English reader. Ἐμαρτυρήθησαν, and μαρτυρηθέντες, clearly refer to the *objective* divine testimony being rendered *subjective* by faith. *For by*, or *through it* (faith) *the elders were witnessed to*, or *became the subjects of divine testimony*, or had the divine testimony *made a testimony to them.*

‡ "I believe that Christ's righteousness must be upon us, and in us, in the same way that it was upon and in himself, before we can be justified." See Mr. G.'s letter above.

his sufferings; the other with him, as entered into his glory. Now, his former, or earthly state, was peculiar to himself. With reference to it, he stood alone, and *of the people there was none with him.* Isaiah lxiii. 3. His present, or heavenly state, however, is that which he graciously condescends to share with us. And the earnest of the state or form of mind which belongs to it, or of his mind as now glorified, is that of which by faith he makes his people partakers. If otherwise, Christ could be of no avail to them. For, if situated in flesh as he was, each one would be obliged to fulfil law for himself, put away his own sin, and raise himself from the dead. In other words, each one would require to be his own Saviour. Blessed be God, however, what Christ now is, his church now is in the world. By faith, one with him, who was once crucified, but now glorified; and, therefore, influenced in so far as they know him by faith, and partake of his divine nature, by the same heavenly principles by which he himself is influenced, and in the same state or form too.*

Secondly. Mr. Galloway's notions of law, although far from being entirely wrong, are sadly confused.—Not understanding the distinction just laid down between Christ in flesh, and Christ in Spirit, and consequently not understanding the doctrine explicitly maintained in Romans vi. and implied throughout the New Testament, he cannot understand, that though Christ in flesh was subject to law—the whole contents of the Old Testament Scriptures having been addressed to and imposed on him as his law, and *magnified, made honourable*, and exhausted, by his *obedience unto death*, Phil. ii. 8—yet Christ in Spirit, or glorified, as having swallowed up law, no less than sin the breach of it, in his one everlasting righteousness, is raised above law. In plain English, he is no longer subject to law; nay, as having exhausted it, he can by no possibility become subject to it. And as one with him glorified, and clothed on with his divine righteousness, we are of course raised above law, its claims, demands, breaches, and punishments, in him.—Again, Mr. Galloway seems to be unable to distinguish accurately between two senses of law, as that word is employed in the Scriptures: one, that of prohibitions and commands; another, that of nature. In the former sense, law was given to Adam, Gen. ii. 16, 17, and it is said, that the *law was given* by Moses. John i. 17. In the latter, God, speaking by the mouth of the Apostle Paul says, *the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus*, the divine nature, *hath made me free from the law of sin and death*, or human nature. Rom. viii. 2. See also Rom. vii. 23, 25. James i. 25, &c. In the former sense, our Lord in flesh was under law; Gal. iv. 4. which, as the divine person, united to the nature of man, he ended by fulfilling it, and by, as his last act of obedience, sacrificing, the nature which sinful in Adam, but sinless as assumed by himself, had fulfilled it. John x. 18. Phil. ii. 8. See also Psalm xxvi. 6, as compared with Psalm xv. *throughout*, and xxiv. 3—10, and Matt. xix. 16—22. In the latter sense, Jesus as risen and glorified is subject to law, and so are his church. That is, our Lord as being through the resurrection and ascension, the new created and glorified man, is subject to no prohibition and no command, all such having by him in flesh and in his death, been exhausted; but he is subject to the divine nature, or God's nature, as the nature of him the glorified man, constitutes his law.† And in as far as they are one with him by faith and love—heavenly and divine principles—his people are not subject to prohibitions and commands of any description; but, as consisting in such principles, to the earnest of the divine nature itself. The *rationale* of this is very simple. Jehovah's nature is subject to Jehovah himself. To suppose the reverse is rank Atheism.‡ But in the case of every creature, and among creatures, or beings situated like creatures, which

* The late Edward Irving, in his "Treatise of Christ's Human Nature," by far the ablest and and profoundest (alas! how unscriptural) work of a religious kind which he ever prodeced, confuses himself, and confuses his readers, by ignorance of, or inability to make the distinction to which we are now drawing Mr. Galloway's and our readers' attention.

† As the glorified man; for as God he is subject to no law, not even that of his nature: law is in every respect, in that sense, subject to him.

‡ See "Divine Inversion," pp. 82, 83.

our blessed Lord, although God, yet considered as the glorified man is, to this axiom there is no exception whatever—viz. the nature of the being constitutes the law of the being. Or to its own nature every being is subject as its law. To its nature, the fly is subject. To its nature, the mouse. To its nature, the dog. To its nature, the elephant. To his nature, man. Rom. viii 7. James i. 13—15.* Consequently, the only freedom which a creature can enjoy, is that of being left to act according to its nature. Gen. iii. 5, 6. And yet, as being essentially under bondage to its nature, freedom on the part of a creature, in the sense of independency, is a notion which may be fitly characterised as the climax of absurdity. Apply this to our present subject. Man, as created, was the subject of his nature. But his nature, however pure and innocent at first, was earthly and fleshly. Gen. ii. 7, and 1 Cor. xv. 47. To any spiritual law therefore whether prohibitory or imperative it was impossible for him to be subject: he having, as created, been made subject to the law of flesh; and it being impossible for his nature, as fleshly, to rise above itself. So says scripture: *the mind of flesh is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither, indeed, can be.* Rom. viii. 7. See, also, Rom. vii. 13—25. Besides, every passage which shews obedience to divine law to have been competent only to the God-man while incarnate, and which traces *the fruits of righteousness* in believers to divine not human principles, decidedly proves it. How then, is man to be raised above sin? How raised above the bondage of human natnre,—the source of sin through law,—to which as a human being, he is essentially and necessarily subject? Scripture answers, by two steps. 1. By that of God uniting himself to human nature—obeying in that nature divine law, which human nature of itself could not do—and by exhausting divine law in that nature, through the sacrifice, or destruction of the obedient nature itself, as the last act of obedience to divine law, of which the nature was capable. 2. Through the conforming of the nature to the person, through its connection with whom the obedience had been performed; or by rendering the nature divine, as the person himself was.—These steps have been taken. The one in Christ's incarnation, obedience and death; the other in Christ's resurrection and ascension. In the latter step, human nature is superseded by the divine nature; the old creation, by the new. This divine nature, this new creation, is through faith, as the subjective indwelling of divine principle, extended to the children of God. Conformed to the nature of God, the being previously clothed upon, and thereby subjected to the nature of man, having it swallowed up in and superseded by the nature of God, becomes the subject of the latter nature. He is a new creature. 2 Cor. v. 17. On the principle of one's nature, as a creature, constituting the true and only law to which one is subject, (see the 6th. chapter of the Romans *throughout,*) the child of God, one with Christ by faith, is even now in earnest, in so far as divine light and love operate upon him, set free from Adam's natnre, by being made a partaker of God's nature, and thereby subjected to God's nature as his law; and one with Christ by sight, when hereafter entirely conformed to the nature of his glorified Redeemer, by being entirely set free from Adam's nature, his only law will be the divine uature. But divine nature has nothing whatever to do with prohibitions and commands. Coloss. ii. 16—23. These belong to a nature capable of becoming unrighteous, (Gen. ii. 16, 17, with iii. 5, 6,)—actually unrighteous, (1 Tim. i. 9, 10,) or, although unrighteous in itself destined to show itself righteous by its union to the divine person. Gal. iv. 4. Divine nature, whether in angels, glorified saints, or believers upon earth, is not subject to prohibitions and commands, and cannot be so. In this sense, the obligations of law have nothing to do with it. In this sense, it is under no obligation to obey law, and, therefore, can perform no act of obe-

* Not to the exclusion of inferior natures being subjected to superior (James iii. 7), but to the exclusion of any creature subjecting itself voluntarily to a higher law than that of its own nature; and to the exclusion of the possibility of any inferior nature being subjected by a superior, except through the medium of, and agreeably to the nature of the inferior.

dience. Indeed for spiritual and glorified ones to have to do either with disobedience or obedience is an utter impossibility. Law, in the sense of prohibitions and commands, is for the unrighteous, not the righteous. 1 Tim. i. 9, 10. To such, it is confined.* The obligations of spiritual and glorified ones consist in their nature itself alone. This alone is their law. Thus considered, the divine nature, put on creatures, is at once the most perfect freedom; *if the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed* (John viii. 36); and the most perfect slavery; *being made free from sin, ye were brought under bondage*, or *became enslaved to righteousness*. Rom. vi. 18. (See Greek.) Set free from human nature, and from all its consequences, not by *being unclothed, but clothed upon*, (2 Cor. v. 4), that is, by having had superinduced upon him the divine nature, the individual is thereby bound to God as His conscious, willing, delighted bond-slave for ever. Psalm cx. 3; Rom. vii. 22—25. *He is crucified with Christ*, as one with Adam, and Adam's descendant; *nevertheless he lives*, as one with Christ, and Christ's descendant; not he, as a human being, but he, as *having Christ living in him*, and as thereby a partaker of Christ's glorified nature, living: *and the life which he now*, and thenceforward *lives in the flesh*, being *by the faith of the Son of God, who loved him and gave himself for him*, that is, by a subjective principle, which as having a reference to a divine object, is itself divine, he is brought under the power of the earnest of the divine nature, as his law or principle of action. Gal. ii. 20. Emancipated he is unquestionably from the *reign of sin* over himself as a partaker of human nature *unto death;* but so far from this happening in consequence of his being set free from all control, it is actually accomplished by means of his being brought under the influence of the most powerful of all controls, or by the establishment over him, through the communication of the divine nature, of *the reign of grace, through righteousness, unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord*. Rom. v. 21. Upon this principle, in Romans sixth, the Holy Ghost replies to the objection, *shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?* The objection indicating ignorance of the fact, that believers are set free from the inferior law of prohibitions and commands only by being brought under the power of the superior law of love, or the divine nature. Divine nature is thus, like every other nature, law. And as the highest, strongest, and most permanent of all natures, it is the highest, strongest, and most permanent of all laws. It is freedom; but it is the freedom not of independence but of oneness with God, and complete subjection to God. Mr. Galloway has erred, by not clearly understanding these elementary scriptural truths. As the consequence, many passages of scripture must be obscure to him. He cannot, looking at matters as he does, see that *love* which *worketh no ill to his neighbour is the fulfilling of the law* (Rom. xiii. 10), not by being subject to law, either in Christ glorified, or in his church, but by itself constituting law. He cannot see that, not only *against the fruit of the Spirit*, which *is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, there is no law* (Gal. v. 22, 23), but that even this *fruit of the Spirit* has nothing whatever to do with law, in the sense of prohibitions and commands—has nothing whatever to do with the obligations of such a law—as its producing cause: a truth which it is the grand object of the inspired apostle in this Epistle to the Galatians, and especially in the fourth and fifth chapters, to evince and establish. He cannot see that it is not law, as inferring the obligation of prohibitions and commands upon the divine nature, but love, or the divine nature, as itself law, that *constraineth us, to live*, not *unto ourselves, but unto him which died for us, and rose again*. 2 Cor. v. 14, 15. He cannot, in a word, see what it is, as influenced by love, to be *under law to Christ*.

Human nature, however, our author may say, and say truly, is still the nature of the believer, while he is in flesh; and human nature is the fitting subject of prohibitions and commands. We cheerfully admit this. We go as far as he can possibly wish us to go, in this respect. As unrighteous, human nature requires all the restraints which law can impose upon it, 1 Tim. i. 9, 10;

* Always excepting, the case of Christ in flesh.

its having inherent in it *lusts of the mind*, as well as *lusts of the flesh*, Eph. ii. 3, it is that against which the believer cannot be too much, or too incessantly on his guard—that which he cannot too humbly, stedfastly, prayerfully *keep under*. 1 Cor. ix. 27. Nay, it is that, which, with its *affections and lusts*, it is the very province of *faith working by love, to crucify*. Gal. v. 24. Upon it, and in opposition to it, as the only self-denying principle, love or the divine nature, cannot too vigorously and too efficiently be brought to bear. *By the terrors of the law, we persuade men*, that is, as human beings, not as partakers of the divine nature, says an inspired apostle. But love, or the divine nature, be it observed, is in the followers of the Lamb, the very principle from which all correct and appropriate dealings with human nature—all crucifixion of that nature, must proceed. And this love, or divine nature, is its own law, or, more correctly is as nature—itself law: *the law of the spirit of life*. Rom. viii. 2. How mistaken and unscriptural, therefore, the idea—and sorry are we to think that our friend, Mr. Galloway, should have been led to entertain and insist on it—that *faith, working by love*, or the principle of the divine nature, —itself the most powerful of all laws, and the believer's law,—should be capable of being brought under the obligation of the law of prohibitions and commands:* a law which is inferior; which Christ ended on his cross, by *nailing it* there; Colos. ii. 14; and from which, by being brought under the influence and obligation of love as the nature of Jesus glorified through the power of his resurrection his people are completely and for ever set free. Rom. vii. 4—6.—See also Luke xiv. 26, 27.

Whether in what precedes we shall have replied satisfactorily to our author's two queries, we know not. This we know, that we have honestly and as briefly as was compatible with perspicuity, answered them. And this we know further, that our statements, after making every allowance for imperfection of human thought and language, will be found in the main agreeable to the revealed testimony of God. The subjects treated of are most important. In considering them we have, while writing cautiously, eschewed all equivocation and all reserve. May Mr. Galloway and his readers be able to apply our remarks, or rather to apply the scriptural truths on which they are founded, to the correction of whatever may be erroneous in his conceptions or phraseology.

A notice which has already run out to such length, must be curtailed of what otherwise might have been its dimensions.

"The Millennium" has it for its grand object to establish the existence of a succession of dispensations, on the part of God, in his dealings with man. We have first, the Legal Dispensation; then, the Gospel Dispensation; and lastly, the Millennium. There is in the work an introduction, followed up by some remarks on God's eternal purpose. And it closes with an Appendix. The whole covers sixty pages, duodecimo.

Ably, we admit, has our author handled his subject.

But no amount of human intelligence can convert error into truth; and erroneous, in common with a vast number of ingenious and learned men, do we conceive our author to be in his leading views respecting the thousand years' reign. This certainly may be said in his favour. So far as he has explained himself, he is not so wild and extravagant in his notions and expectations, as was Elhanan Winchester: a remark, of the correctness of which anyone may satisfy himself, by a comparison of the tract now lying before us, with the four volumes of "Discourses on Prophecy," delivered by the celebrated American

* Love was while in flesh the mind of Christ's *divine* person, and *thereby* of his *human* nature. Love, now that he is glorified, is the mind of his divine person and *divine* nature. What in him, in flesh, was *human* nature, is now through his resurrection and ascension, *divine* nature. The *person* in both cases is the same. But in flesh, *human nature* in Christ loved God and obeyed God, through its union with his divine person, in opposition to what were its tendencies and acts in creatures, and to what would have been its tendencies, unless so united, and unless, as so united, rendered pure, heavenly and perfect. Whereas, in spirit, changed as *human* nature is into *divine nature*, Christ's *divine* nature loves God, and is carried out continually towards him, by its own innate and irrepressible tendencies. The person and the nature now are not merely one—even in flesh they were so—but their *native* tendencies also are one.

Universalist, in the Borough of Southwark, somewhere about 1788 or 1789. Would Mr. Galloway choose to interpret the prophecies of Ezekiel as literally, as unscripturally, and as absurdly as his predecessor has done? We fancy not. And yet, differing in many respects, especially as to details, as the two writers do, the fundamental principles of both are unquestionably the same.

Restoration of the Jews, even previously to their believing in Christ, to the land of Palestine, followed by the manifestation of Christ in flesh and blood, his taking up his kingly abode at Jerusalem, and the resurrection and reign of the saints upon earth with him, in flesh and blood bodies, during the period literally of a thousand years, is what Mr. Galloway, along with Winchester, seems to anticipate. In what state exactly the earth, according to their notions, is then to be, is what, we confess, we can no more make out from our friend's statements, than we can from those of other writers who have adopted views of this subject similar to his own. Sometimes we catch expressions appearing to indicate that the earth will then be changed. At other times, judging from their language, it will in their apprehension continue to be the same. Although, however, there is great confusion in the mind as regards this point—a confusion which has extended to their words also—the latter, or that the earth will be the same, is probably what they mean. The human beings over whom, in their opinion, the saints are to reign during the millennium, are beings in flesh and blood bodies; and therefore it cannot but be the same earth in very much its present state that such beings are to inhabit, and by the fruits of which they are to be supported.

Now the whole of this theory, by whomsoever devised, (and it is very ancient,) and by whomsoever adopted,* we have no hesitation in pronouncing to be a mere hallucination and figment of the human mind.

It is founded on the same radical mistake which caused the Jews of our Lord's time, literally interpreting the Old Testament Scriptures, to apply to themselves, as a nation, prophecies which respect the true *Israel of God.*† Matt. xxi. 28—46, xxii. 1—14; John viii. 33—58; Rom. ii. 28, 29; Phil. iii. 3. And, in the same spirit of fundamental blundering, it supposes God in his dispensations to be restoring or going backwards; whereas, in his whole procedure, he is going forwards: not restoring anything, whether Adam's paradisaical state, or Moses' economy, but rendering the passing away of both, subservient to the introduction and establishment of an economy and state of things infinitely higher. See Heb. vii. 18, 19.‡

This, however, is not all. Many other mistakes and those not unimportant ones either, are involved in and affect the fleshly millennial system.

It mistakes the meaning of the phrase, *a thousand years*, despite the hints given in Psalm xc. 4, and 2 Peter iii. 8. It overlooks the fact, that earth, in its present state, and in any state short of being new-created, as it has been the scene of Christ's visible sufferings, so is it, and so is it destined to be the scene of the church's visible sufferings, and not of its visible triumph. Luke xiv. 14; 1 Cor. ii. 9; 2 Cor. v. 17, with Isaiah lxv. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 17; 1 John iii. 2; and 2 Peter iii. 10—13; as well as John xii. 32, and xiv. 3. It contradicts scripture, in supposing that human beings, continuing possessed of the principles of human nature only, can either in the millennium, or in any other state, yield a voluntary submission to what is spiritual and divine; *the mind of flesh* not only being *enmity against God*, but labouring under an absolute impossibility of displaying any other qualities or results than these of enmity. Rom. viii. 7; Gal. v. 17. It is inconsistent with our Lord's declaration that *strait is the gate, and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it* (Matt. vii. 14): a declaration intended to apply to every state of things, which shall

* An immense mass of information, not particularly well digested, but showing great learning, concerning this and kindred topics, we have encountered in a work, entitled "L'Anti-Christ," by Florimond de Raemond, *Cambray*, 1613, for the possession and perusal of which we are indebted to the Rev. Dr. Dobbin, of Hull.

† Gal. vi. 16.

‡ Ἐπεισαγωγὴ δὲ κρείττονος ἐλπίδος, *was the bringing in of a better hope.* See margin.

precede the entire ultimate supersession of human nature, by the divine nature. With other mistakes, *quæ longum esset dicere.*

That the thousand years, or millennium (Rev. xx. 4, 5), signify the period of the reign of Christ with his church, is, as divinely revealed, a fundamental article of our own faith. But a thousand years, it appears to us, guided by God's own interpretation of the language, is a definite put down for an indefinite number. This settled, the whole of the edifice, constructed on the opposite assumption, falls to the ground.

The millennium, understood as the period of the reign of Christ and the church, is twofold, or rather is to be viewed under a twofold aspect.

1. There is the earnest of the millennium in flesh, extending from the destruction of Jerusalem till the end of time. During this period or day, be it longer or be it shorter, Christ, not visibly, but really is reigning in and with his people over the earth. *This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.* 1 John v. 4. *To him that overcometh,* by faith, *will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my father in his throne.* Rev. iii. 21; see ii. 26. Thus are the elect even now *the kings of the earth* (i. 5), and *reign with* Christ *on the earth,* as to their bodies, although *dwelling* with him *in heaven* as to their minds (xiii. 6). The world is thus, even now, although ignorant of the fact, subject to the church; which, availing itself of existing facts and circumstances, is quietly progressing in knowledge and love, and quietly adding to the number of its real members. Acts xiii. 48; James i. 18; Rev. xiv. 4. The earth, or world, is unconsciously, all the while, *helping the woman* (xii. 16). *Satan is bound* and *chained* (xx. 2); either not knowing what is going on, and the mighty steps for his final overthrow and destruction, which are being taken; or if knowing them, unable from his position to effect his purpose, by inducing the world to join with him in crushing the church. But when, towards the close of time, and after *the fulness of the Gentiles shall* have *come in* (Rom. xi. 25), the Jews, enlightened from above, join the church, and thus enter, not typically, but antypically, *into their own land;* that is, when they shew themselves to be true Jews, by being possessed of Abraham their ancestor's faith (Rom. ii. 28, 29, iv. 12); then are the world's eyes at last and suddenly opened. Then is *Satan loosed out of his prison.* Rev. xx. 7. Then is the world's grand and final attempt made to subvert and destroy the church (xx. 8). And then, by means of Christ's immediate interposition, and second appearing, follow the saints' glorification, and the world's overthrow and destruction by fire (xx. 9). Also 1 Thess. i. 10, iv. 13—17; 2 Thess. i. 7, 8, ii. 8; Heb. ix. 28; 2 Peter iii. 10—13. Time is no longer.

2. The scene of the Millennium now changes from earth to heaven; or, the earnest of it enjoyed on earth through faith, is now exchanged for its true and full fruition in heaven by sight. 2 Cor. v. 6—8. 1 John iii. 2. This is *the resurrection of the just,* completed. Luke xiv. 14, and Acts xxiv. 15, *compared with* Eph. ii. 5, 6, and Coloss. ii. 12. Christ and his church thenceforward reign, no longer invisibly, but visibly. Matthew xiii. 43, with Rom. viii. 19, and 2 Thess. i. 10. And the earth or world, previously to the eye of sense in the ascendant over them, is thenceforward, to the eye purged, new-created, and glorified, visibly under their feet. Psalm viii. 6, cx. 1. 1 Cor. vi. 2, xv. 23—25. Heb. ii. 8, 9. This state of things continues during the whole of the mediatorial period or æon—a period, with references to which, the Testaments Old and New are full. See especially 1 Cor. xv. 24—28. Rev. xxi. 6—*to the end,* &c. Indefinite, to be sure, this period is to us; but known to and ascertained by God. 2 Peter iii. 8. Also, Acts xv. 18. Sufficiently long to fulfil every prophetic intimation, and to answer all his blessed and glorious purposes. The books have been opened. Rev. xx. 12. Judgment has been pronounced and executed on the wicked. *Ibid.* 13—15. From the heavenly kingdom, *flesh and blood,* and *all that defileth,* have been excluded. 1 Cor. xv. 50. Rev. xxi. 8, 27.—On, meanwhile, flows the glorious reign. And at last it is consummated. The serpent's head, bruised virtually in the death and resurrection of Christ, is then, in the fulness of Christ's power, manifested to be so.

Gen. iii. 15, with 1 Cor. xv. 27, 28. The conquest of Christ, reigning with his church, is then complete. The language of inspired prophecy, *Jehovah said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool*, Psalm cx. 1, is then accomplished. The unregenerate, who, on earth, had, in spite of themselves, borne unwillingly the Redeemer's yoke, are then willingly, in this *his day of power*, made subject to its easy and gentle pressure. Dan. iv. 35, and Rom. ix. 17, with Psalm cx. 2, 3. And this, through the process of new creation to which as a portion of those who *have borne the image of the earthy*, (1 Cor. xv. 49,) they are subjected. For, as the blood of Christ, who *tasted death for every man*, Heb. ii. 9, hath put away sin, by swallowing it up, in the case of all, so shall the power of Christ's resurrection, when ultimately put forth in the case of the unregenerate, be the means of *destroying death* completely, by *swallowing it up in victory*. Eph. i. 10; with Isaiah xxv. 7, 8; and 1 Cor. xv. 25, 26, 54; also, 1 John iii. 8. "*Behold I make all things new.*" Rev. xxi. 5.—This is the millennium's euthanasia, or consummation. Christ and the church have reigned over the earth, or the unregenerate portion of humanity. Rev. v. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 27. And, their reign, as the reign of love, that is, of God himself. 1 John iv. 8, 16, has achieved its object. Rom. xii. 21. As its result, *God is all in all*, 1 Cor. xv. 28, and *the old heavens and earth have passed away*, being superseded completely and for ever, by *new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness*. Isaiah lxv. 17, lxvi. 22; and 2 Peter iii. 13. Also Rev. xxi. 1.

After such decided disapprobation of Mr. Galloway's views, and such an explicit although necessarily condensed statement of our own, to enter upon a more minute examination of his theory would be superfluous.

We are far from being satisfied with our author's language respecting the nature and powers of the Adamic and unregenerate will of man; and respecting the manner in which the gospel enters into and enlightens the conscience. When, but too frequently stumbling on phraseology which seems to indicate the notion of some condition, or conditions of life everlasting yet remaining to be fulfilled by the creature, we feel as if our worthy and respected friend had not by the teachings of the Spirit been thoroughly purged from the dregs of Pelagianism and Arminianism, in reference to this subject. Still, it is not agreeable to us to find fault. And, therefore, before parting with our friend, we would say, that he will never find us contending with him, or destitute of sympathy for him, (see p. 48), when he maintains, "a connection and relationship betwixt the death of Christ, and the final death of the world by Christ;" and, "that the latter is caused by the former, and is of one nature with it, and prepares the way for the same glorious result, namely, the being exalted to fellowship with God, of those who shall pass through it" (pp. 48 and 49.) Without wishing to be hypercritical, on the principle of divine inversion, which implies that through the imparting of divine life, death on Adam's nature is inflicted, (Rev. xiv. 13), we might have altered the latter part of the sentence, besides altering some preceding phrases, by saying "carrying it," Christ's death, "into effect, in the very act of exalting into fellowship with God, by the application to them of the power of Christ's resurrection, beings who, through unbelief, had been previously excluded from His kingdom." He will find us agreeing with him in recording our protest with his against two classes of "belief," which he properly and scripturally condemns. (p. 49.) Correct is he, when, speaking of the second death as undergone by the unregenerate, he declares, that "they are to die, because he," Christ, "did die for them, and did not die for them in vain—their death follows his as a natural unavoidable result," (their death being involved in his, on account of their oneness with him, in his capacity of second Adam,) "and is the very end," (we should prefer saying "one of the very ends,") "to accomplish which he did die. Christ never died for any man to keep him from dying." True, scriptually understood, His people escape the second death. John xi. 25, 26, with Rev. ii. 11, and xx. 6; and this, by becoming par-

takers of the first resurrection. *Ibid.* But in being made alive in Christ even here, and much more at the period of the second coming of Christ, and resurrection of their bodies, death is inflicted on their Adamic nature. Through living in Christ, they die in Adam, by that supersession of human nature, which is involved in new creation, or the superinduction on them of the divine nature. 2 Cor. v. 4—17. "Christ died for us that we might become quickened with the divine life, through having the creature life—purged out of us." (A preferable mode of expressing oneself would be "creature life—superseded by Christ's divine life." See Gal. ii. 20. However, we think we understand what our author means, and are far from being disposed to be captious.) "He died, that we dying with him in the fellowship of his death might live with him in the fellowship of his life." (Upon the whole the idea is correct. Only, as in the application to creatures of our Lord's sacrifice and resurrection, the process which took place in his own case is inverted, so it is by having fellowship with him in his life, or by being made partakers of the power of his resurrection, that we are made to have fellowship with him in his sufferings and death. (See Phil. iii. 10.) "Why is the second death to have no power on those, who have put on the first resurrection? Because the life against which the second death is to prevail, "the life of Adam," is not to be found in them at all, through dying with Jesus now," (rather through having the earnest of the divine life of Jesus now conferred on them, by faith,) "they get quit of this life which is to succumb to the second death, so that when the death of the great world cometh," through the application to the great world, after having undergone the second death, of the life of Jesus, they are to be found possessing only that life over which death hath no power. (pp. 49, 50.) (A slight alteration might have been suggested: however, let it pass.)* With the enunciation of such truths as the foregoing, even although somewhat imperfectly expressed, we are delighted. The Lord bless their promulgation. Higher views of the subject our author may well think, will be "an unfolding," "not a contradiction" of these. We, like him, "have no hesitation in saying, that, when condemning the world at last, Christ's love to the world," viewed as new-created in himself, "will be as strong at least as it was, when he was dying for it on the cross." We, like him, "can sing of judgment as well as of mercy, and sing of mercy in singing of judgment." (p. 50.) How sweet to read such language, breathing as it does the spirit of Him, who is

"The sinner's friend, but sin's eternal foe."

Esteeming, and for the truth's sake, loving Mr. Galloway as we do, it is perfectly refreshing and edifying to us to find sentiments such as these to which we have just adverted, flowing from his pen. But will he excuse us, if, with all friendliness, we urge upon him, if he would speak consistently with himself, and, what is of more consequence, consistently with *the lively oracles*, the eschewing of all attempts to ascribe to man's will a power, which, as hostile to God and dead in sin, it does not possess, (Rom. viii. 7, Gal. v. 17, Eph. ii. 1), to conditionalize the gospel, which is simply a proclamation of all conditions having been fulfilled by the Son of God, (John xix. 30; Rom. iii. 27, 28; Gal. iii. 6—14; Phil. ii. 8, 9; Titus iii. 5,) to confound the state of Christ in flesh, with the state of Christ in Spirit, (Rom. vi. 3—10, viii. 3, 4; Phil. ii.

* "For it is not by pain that souls are to be purified." p. 51. Not by their own pains or sufferings is obviously what our author means. For well does he know that it is *by the travail* or pains of Christ's *soul, he is satisfied*, in the accomplishment of the work of man's salvation. Isa. liii. 11. And it is by the application of this travail or these pains of Jesus, through the power of his resurrection, that "souls" (no longer such, but in the act of purification new-created as spirits) "are purified." Will Mr. Galloway excuse us for the suggesting of particular care and accuracy in the language which we employ respecting scriptural doctrines. There are *some things* in the paragraph beginning, "The sufferings connected with the second death," &c, which, considering God's hatred of sin, and of Adam's nature as stained with sin, and considering the sufferings of him *who*, although he *knew no sin, was* yet *made sin for us*, are rather questionable. Did Mr. G. reflect when he denied the sufferings of which he speaks to be "strictly penal"? "Purgatorial," certainly, they are not. It is Christ's blood alone which cleanseth, or purgeth, from all sin.

6—11; Heb. ii. 6—10, ix. 28,) to represent the divine nature which is itself the highest of all laws, as subject to any inferior and exterior laws of prohibition and command, (Rom. vi. 14, 18, (Greek), 2 Cor. v. 14, 15; also, 1 Tim. 1—9,) and to make the experience of Christ's death to precede in us, the application to us of the power of his resurrection. Eph. i. 17—21; Phil. iii. 10. Christian principle we are well assured is necessarily productive of Christian practice. James ii. 14—26. But Christian principle is Christian truth, or, *faith that worketh by love;* and, therefore to expect from human and erroneous views concerning the scriptures, what from *the light of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ, shining into the heart,* (2 Cor. iv. 6,) alone can spring, would be to expect to gather *grapes from thorns or figs from thistles.*

D. T.

Sacramental Religion subversive of Vital Christianity. Two Sermons preached at Bloomsbury Chapel, on Sunday, Nov. 3rd. By the Rev. WILLIAM BROCK. London: H. K. Lewis. 1850.

ARCHBISHOP Leighton, it is said, when urged on one occasion "to preach to the times," begged to know, if he himself, a poor sinner, and addressing fellow sinners, might not be indulged "in preaching for eternity."

Whether true or not, the anecdote is a good one; and is eminently suggestive of the duty of believers of the gospel, to abstain, as much as possible, from intermeddling with passing events, and secular politics; while, at the same time, they are careful to impress on the minds of others, by example as well as words, the supreme importance of those eternal verities and realities, which, through the scriptures, it hath pleased God to make known to the guilty children of men.

Still, passing events do occasionally justify, nay, demand the special attention of the followers of the Lamb; especially of those who have undertaken to speak publicly to others, concerning *the great things of God.*

The pamphlet now before us is a very excellent specimen of the manner in which a teacher of religion should, proceeding on scriptural principles, draw attention to the controversies of the day. It exhibits one phase of what has been deemed Christianity, found to be awanting, and denounced as antagonistic to the glory of God, and the good of the souls of men.

Every age has its peculiar hobbies, civil and religious, and its peculiar ways of trying to stir up the dormant energies of the human mind. Effete and nearly dead protestantism required, to use Dean Swift's phrase, "a flapper." This it has found for some years past, in Tractarianism, or semi-popery; and this it is now finding in full-blown popery itself. The waters of Bethesda, so long stagnant, are now being fearfully agitated. That healing influences will ultimately be the result, we make no question. But how? That remains to be seen.

Two Sermons, one on Baptism, and the other on the Lord's Supper, constitute the contents of Mr. Brock's pamphlet. They are clearly, sensibly, and powerfully composed. The quotations from Tractarian writers, in which they abound, are valuable and seasonable. Happily, on the whole, (we are not disposed to be hypercritical), does he state the leading doctrines of God's Word, which have a more immediate reference to the topics that occupy his attention. And most distinct is his contrast between what is denominated Sacramental grace, and that grace of God which reigns through the righteousness of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ unto life everlasting. Seldom, in so small a compass, have we encountered so complete and so happy an exposure of popish errors.

May God bless his labours, and the labours of all others, who, in opposition to Satanic delusions, are engaged in pointing to him who is THE TRUTH, and in *contending for the faith once delivered to the saints.*

D. T.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

SIR,—In No. 10 of *The Universalist*, we are favoured by D. T. with a Review of "Ireland as I saw it," the work of W. S. Balch. The writings of the reviewer to me have been invaluable. Again and again have I perused almost the whole with delight, and without meeting with a single sentence to which I could not say 'Amen.' Towards the reviewer I find esteem and gratitude spontaneously flowing in unceasing streams, from all that as a man or a Christian is within my heart, accompanied with unfeigned love.

The review was pleasing and delightful as the former works of the reviewer had ever been, till coming to the words "*We object to the system of God's universal love being taught to the world at all.*" This brought the reader to a stand-still. For a few minutes he could not read on, and concluded that that statement must surely be qualified by some other expression in the review. In this mind he resumed the perusal. Soon he came to the words, "Let the gospel be the first and only thing proclaimed and spoken of to ungodly men. And to them let it be proclaimed in purity, be the consequences what they may." To this the responding breathing of the heart was, *Hold* to this, my dearly beloved friend and brother; nothing more scriptural can be expressed by man: this qualifies, yea, all but makes void the sentiment quoted before. An answer to the following question must *bear* upon this subject:—Can the gospel of the grace of God be preached to any, without proclaiming the universal love of God?

What says the Bible? God preached the gospel to Abraham—"In thy seed shall *all* nations, kindreds families of the earth be blessed." David preached the gospel—"All the ends of the earth shall turn unto the Lord. All the kindreds of the nations shall bow before him. Men shall be blessed in him, and all nations shall call him blessed. All the earth shall worship thee. All thy works shall praise thee. Mercy shall be built up for ever. All that go down to the dust shall bow before him, and none can keep alive his own soul."

Isaiah proclaimed the gospel—"I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation to the ends of the earth. And he will destroy the face of the covering that is cast upon all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations."

Hosea proclaimed the gospel—"In the place where it was said to them, ye are not my people, there it shall be said to them, ye are the sons of the living God. I will ransom from death; O death, I will be thy plagues! O grave, I will be thy destruction.

Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Hosea proclaimed that the Moabites, Ammonites, Elamites, and even the Sodomites who suffered the vengeance of eternal fire, shall all be delivered from their captivity by the new and everlasting covenant.

The King of kings preached the gospel, saying, "I came to save the lost—to save the world. I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." This was preached to both Greeks and Jews, and is surely a proclamation of the universal love of God. To a great multitude of Gentiles, and contradicting and blaspheming Jews, where in all probability there were not a dozen believers, Paul preached the gospel, proclaiming to all—"Through this man is proclaimed to you the forgiveness of sins. God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself."

John preached the gospel, saying, "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that is in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever." These, and a thousand more passages of scripture are inexplicable in any other way than that of understanding them as proclamations of the universal love of God. Therefore we do not find how we can object to the system of universal love being taught to the world, without objecting to the preaching to them the gospel of the grace of God.

"Scripture doctrines, as they cannot be understood, so are they all liable to be abused by the carnal mind of man."

This is a scriptural truth, to which all who have eyes to see, and ears to hear what is coming to pass in the religious world, must say 'Amen.' But this was also true in the days of Moses and the prophets, Jesus and the apostles. Therefore if it was justifiable to hold forth to the notice, and parade before the eyes of unregenerate men *then*, the universal love of God, we do not see how it can be objected to *now*.

It is true that "the gospel has actually been abused to licentious purposes, not only by hypocritical and deluded professors of it, but even by believers of the truth themselves." And it is also written that the unlearned and the unstable wrest the scriptures to their own destruction. Now if the gospel and the universal love of God is with a certain degree of reserve to be suggested to such, the like must be done with regard to the whole of the revelation of grace. If we, for fear of running the risk of opening the flood-gates of immortality and crime, or, by omission, obstruct the free course of the gospel, we may go on to the extreme of the Pharisees of old, lock the door of the kingdom of heaven, and keep ourselves, and all others on the outside.

ANETAZO.

THE UNIVERSALIST.

JANUARY, 1851.

ON GEN. II. 7.—THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

I observed in the number for last March, p. 49, that "there are perhaps no instances in which the sense of Scripture is so much obscured as by the mistranslation of the words αιων and αιωνιος, so much so, that to this cause the doctrine of endless torment is to be chiefly attributed." Nearly connected with this, and attended with similar results, is the general misconception relating to the immortality of the soul; which, as supposed, is conferred on it, as a constituent of its nature by creation, and therefore indestructible by the most intense and unintermitting sufferings, and amid the total wreck of the material universe. This, however, is not the doctrine of Scripture, but of heathen philosophy: witness the well-known soliloquy, which Addison puts into the mouth of Cato.

"It must be so; Plato, thou reasonest well," &c.

It is also the common opinion, derived from the same corrupt source, that a suffering immortality will be the doom of the far greater part of mankind. But this, I say, is not the doctrine of Scripture, which, on the contrary, teaches that immortality is derived, not from creation, but from redemption—an immortality not of soul, but of a higher principle,—and, of necessity, a universal blessing, excluding all posthumous suffering, whether penal, purgatorial, or corrective. This will fully appear from a comparison of the principal texts relating to the subject, among which that stands first which records the creation of man.

"And the Lord God formed the man, dust of (or from) the ground; and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul,"—person, or animated frame. Gen. ii. 7.

Air is thus the animating principle of all living bodies; for "all have one breath." Eccles. iii. 19. In this there is an analogy between the habitation and the inhabitants: the former consisting of the *heavens* and the *earth:* and the latter of *breath* derived from the heavens, and *dust* derived fom the earth.

We also read thus in the prophet Ezekiel.

"Then he said to me, Prophesy to the wind (margin, *breath*), son of man, and say to the wind, Thus saith the Lord Jehovah, Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe on these slain, that they may live. So I prophesied, as he commanded me, and the breath came into

them, and they lived, and stood up on their feet, an exceeding great army." xxxvii. 9, 10.

This vision exhibits a circumstantial enlargement of the process in Gen. ii. 7, and exemplifies nothing above the reception of mere animal life. Surely it exhibited to the prophet's view men of the same kind as Adam; and yet it tells us of no animating principle beyond what came from "the four winds." He then proceeds to show, in ver. 11—14, that this principle is the type of that higher spiritual life, which God bestows on his people; and which is received only through the new creation in Christ. Paul also, to the same purpose, contrasts the *soulical* nature of Adam with the spiritual nature of Christ. "The first man, Adam, was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening (or life-giving) spirit." 1 Cor. xv. 45. The former is soulical, and possessor of mere natural life; the latter is spiritual, and sole possessor and giver of life and immortality. So far indeed is the Adamic nature from possessing immortality, that we inherit nothing from it but sin and death; but, "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." 1 Cor. xv. 22. Under every point of view, we see the falsehood of the popular opinion. "Cursed is the ground," says the original sentence, "for thy sake, in sorrow thou shalt eat of it all the days of thy life. Thorns also and thistles it shall bring forth to thee, and thou shalt eat the herb of the field. In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread, till thou return to the ground; for out of it thou wast taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return." Gen. iii. 17—19. From this passage we learn, that the whole natural life is that which is sustained by natural food; that the whole natural death consists in the dissolution of the body; and hence this death does not lead to suffering, but that suffering leads to and terminates in death. *Divine philanthropy* (Tit. iii. 4.) has thus appointed the present earthly sinful, suffering, and transitory life, to enhance the value of that which is heavenly, holy, happy, and endless. Hence the call of the Psalmist to universal praise and thanksgiving—"Let everything that hath breath praise Jehovah." Ps. cl. 6,—a call, to which the beloved disciple witnessed, in vision, a universal response: "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever. Rev. v. 12, 13.

R. R.

ON THE UNIVERSALITY OF GOD'S LOVE TO MAN.

God has given to us a revelation, in which he reveals himself as a God of Light (1 John i. 5), and by which it is manifest, that God is love (1 John iv. 8), by our minds being illuminated by that same power which said, "Let there be light, and there was light" (Gen. i. 3); for whatever makes manifest is light. Eph. v. 13. It is only by natural light, that we are enabled to see natural things; and it is only by spiritual light, that we can know anything of spiritual things.

Man by his nature is opposed to God (Rom. viii. 7, Eph. ii. 3), and it is only by the light of the Scriptures that he can know anything of himself as to what he really is; or of what God really is (Jer. xvii. 9, Matt. xi. 27, xvi. 17). By divine illumination he is given to know (2 Cor. iv, 6), that the light in him is but gross darkness (Matt. vi. 23); that his wisdom is not only foolishness but enmity to God (1 Cor. iii. 19, Rom. viii. 7); that he can in no degree testify of God; that his reason cannot comprehend revelation (1 Cor. ii. 14); and that it is by faith only, he can know that God created the worlds, by the power of his word, and that because God himself hath said it (Heb. xi. 3, Ps. xxxiii. 6).

Though man cannot testify of God, he by the Scriptures testifies unto man by Jesus Christ, that his love is the great cause of our existence; that it was his especial purpose, before time began, to manifest himself to us his creatures, as a God of Love (Eph. chap. iii.); by his creating the world (Is. xlv. 18), and more especially in his forming man, a being possessed of soul (1 Cor. xv. 45), whose fleshly mind is enmity to God, not subject to his law, nor able to be so (Rom. viii. 7); and yet a being made specially and expressly after the image and likeness of him (Gen. i. 27), the second man, the Lord from heaven (1 Cor. xv. 47), who in the beginning was the word, who was with God (John i. 1), and who was God made manifest in flesh (John i. 14); who was the first born of every creature (Col. i. 15); who created all things, and in whom and by whom all things exist (Col. i. 16, 17); and consequently a being destined by grace and the purpose of God, to be in due time conformed to his Maker, and enjoy him throughout eternity; not by being restored to the state that Adam originally had before his fall; but by being newly created in Christ Jesus, by being put to death in his flesh, and quickened by his spirit, and consequently elevated to a state far superior to any that Adam could of himself, by any possibility have enjoyed. 1 Peter iii. 18.

God formed man of the dust of the ground. and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life only: and man became a living creature (Gen. ii. 7), and was therefore a proper subject to be placed under a negative and prohibitory law, which would have been impossible had he been possessed of real life itself, which is spirit (which is God) because spirit knows no law, for law worketh death. Rom. chap. vii.

Had man obeyed that negative aud prohibitory law which God addressed to him, "of all the trees in the garden thou mayst freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die" (Gen. 2. 16, 17), he would have continued at the best but a fleshly minded man; not only entirely ignorant of, but deprived of all immortality and life—which were brought to light only by Jesus Christ and his gospel (2 Tim. i. 10), which alone is the wisdom and the power of God unto salvation (Rom. i. 16, 1 Cor. i. 24), and would have realized at the most but a continuous animal existence.

God displayed his love to man by issuing to Adam that prohibitory law, that he might shew the inability of man to abstain from violating even one prohibition, and that addressed merely to his appetite: that by his act of disobedience he should incur death, and be prevented from taking hold of the Tree of Life himself—lest he should eat thereof and have lived for ever a guilty man (Gen. iii. 22); in order that God might then proclaim his love to him still further in the promise, that "The Seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent, through the bruising of his own heel (Gen. iii. 15); thus the law entered, that the offence might abound, that where the sin of the creature abounded, in the transgression of a single negative and fleshly law, the grace of the glorious Creator might much more abound, in the complete fulfilment of positive and divine laws, by Jesus Christ, to the honour and glory of God, by him, humbling the creature and exalting the Saviour; in depriving the former of his natural life in order to bestow him

through the latter, eternal life as his gift; by putting him to death with Christ in his flesh, to be quickened with Christ in his resurrection by his spirit. Rom. v. 20, 21; vi. 23; 1 Peter iii. 18.

Adam was the source of all mankind; and he, by disobedience to the first prohibition, brought into the world sin and death, and so death passed upon all men (Rom. v. 12): for the whole human race sinned in Adam, for they were all in him, and were possessed of the same common nature with him (Acts xvii. 26, Mal. ii. 10); and consequently the whole world became guilty before God (Rom. iii. 19—22), who hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all (Rom. xi. 32); that the free gift of righteousness, might not be as the offence by the one (Adam) was, namely, sin and condemnation; but that it might be unto the justification of all men unto life, by the reigning of the righteousness of one, even Jesus Christ (Rom. v. 15—21) our Lord. Acts ii. 36.

Adam had in him the seed of death; for he was made of the dust of the ground, and was destined to return to the ground as dust (Gen. iii. 19); he was the clay in the hands of the heavenly potter, who made him first a marred vessel of flesh and blood (Jer. xviii. 4); and as such he could not enter the kingdom of heaven (1 Cor. xv. 50). In order to do so, he had to become changed—his natural body into heavenly body; his natural mind into heavenly mind; and this, by his undergoing death (1 Cor. xv. 53, 54), and by being newly created, and made a partaker of the resurrection state of Christ (Rom. xiv. 8, 9), with mind and body assimilated to him of whom Adam was the type, figure, and shadow, reflected by Christ Jesus the substance. Rom. v. 14.

God executes all his threatenings, and fulfils all his promises.

He caused the kingdom of God to be preached by John, until whose coming the law and the prophets were; and as it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail (Luke xvi. 16, 17); therefore it is, that in due time the seed of the woman appeared. God took upon himself the nature of man (Heb. ii. 14, 16) with sin attached—was born of a woman, and consequently was under the law, Gal. iv. 4. It behoved Christ to be born of a woman, in order to become subjected to law. He appeared in the likeness of sinful flesh (Rom. viii. 3), but was sinless himself (1 Pet. ii. 22, Heb. iv. 15); and became emphatically the God-man, God with us, Mat. i. 23. The word was made flesh (John i. 14), to whom law was meat and drink, his meditation and delight (Ps. cxix. 97); for his whole life consisted in living in perfect obedience, in thought, word, and deed, to all God's statutes, judgments, and ordinances; for he had the mind of God, by which he crucified the flesh, with its affections and lusts, Gal. v. 24, vi. 14.

It was to Christ, the faithful and believing one, that all divine law was properly addressed; and it behoved him to fulfil all law (Mat. v. 17, 18); and to be delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification (Rom. iv. 25); that all things might be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning him, Luke xxiv. 44—46.

God having declared that the sacrifices of bulls and of goats satisfied him not Is. i. 11—14; and that it was impossible for their blood to take away sins (Heb. x. 4), and yet without blood being shed there could be no remission of sins (Heb. ix. 22); provided himself a special sacrifice in his own well beloved son, who appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself Heb. ix. 26; and through the eternal Spirit, to offer himself without spot to God (Heb. ix. 14), to whom he saith that sacrifice and offering for sin thou wouldst not (Ps. xl. 6), neither hadst thou pleasure therein (Heb. x. 8), 'Lo I come in the volume of the book it is written of me to do thy will O God" Heb. x. 7.

In due time Christ was to give himself a ransom for all (1 Tim. ii. 6) to die for the ungodly (Rom. v. 6). although he had obeyed every law positive and negative, that by dying and tasting death for every man (Heb. ii. 9) he might by this last act of obedience, destroy law by fulfilling it, and become the end of

it for righteousness unto every one that believeth (Rom. x. 4); and that he might by his being raised from the dead, and made perfect (Heb. v. 9), through the righteousness of his faith (Phil. iii. 9), bring in everlasting salvation to a guilty and condemned world; for God so loved the world, that he sent his only begotten Son into the world (1 Jo. iv. 9). to be the propitiation for its sins (1 John iv. 10), to die the just one (Acts iii. 14, vii. 52, xxii. 14), for the unjust (I Pet. iii. 18), that by his lifting him up and raising him from the dead (Acts ii. 24), the prince of this world should be cast out (John xii. 31). and all men be drawn to himself (John xii. 32), and be saved by the ressurrection life of Christ and know that which the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh (Rom. viii. 3). Christ himself did; he put away sin for ever, through the offering of his body (Heb. x. 10); that the gospel might be there proclaimed.

Be it known unto you men and brethren that by this man is the forgivenes of sins (Acts xiii. 38), whose name is called the Word of God (Rev. xix. 13), and whose testimony is the spirit of prophecy (Rev. xix. 10).

As it is appointed unto all men once to die and after that its execution; so Christ was once offered (Heb. ix. 27, 28) on the accursed tree, being made a curse for us (Gal. iii. 13), that he might redeem us, the whole family of man, from the power of the law which is death; and this he did on the cross when he cried it is finished (John xix. 30). He was obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; therefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God (Phil. ii. 8—11): this hath the Lord, the just God and Saviour, sworn by himself Is. xlv. 21—23.

Christ was faith itself embodied (Heb. xi. 1, xii. 2): he believed in God and therefore he knew his body would be redeemed from the power of the grave (Ps. xlix. 15), and his soul raised from hades the third day, and that God would receive him (Matt. xvi. 21). He died, he brought law to an end in himself by fulfilling it, and he made it honourable; he destroyed law also, by becoming the end of it, and thereby destroyed sin itself; for the strength of sin is the law (I Cor. xv. 56); and where no law is there is no transgression, Rom. iv. 15. He by his death reconciled a guilty world to God, and destroyed death in himself (2 Tim. i. 10). and him that had the power of death, that is the devil (Heb. ii. 14, Rev. xii. 9), he also underwent the punishment of hades and destroyed its power, Rev. xx. 13, 14.

The death of Christ was introductory to his resurrection from the dead (John x. 17, 18, xii. 24, 25), and his ascension to his father. He had power to lay down his life and had power to take it up again; no man took his life from him, he was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Rev. xiii. 8), the type and antitype of the slain female lamb (Lev. iv. 32), and of every Jewish sacrifice.

In due time God raised his soul from Hades (Acts ii, 31), and did not suffer his body to see corruption (Acts xiii. 37); He rose from the dead triumphant over law, sin, death, and hades, leading captivity captive (Ps. lxviii. 18, Eph. iv. 8), and was received into glory, 1 Tim. iii. 16. By his resurrection, he destroyed completely the power of the grave over the bodies of men; and by destroying death, by undergoing hades, also destroyed its power over the souls of men (Hos. xiii. 14), and became an ocean of life to pour out his spirit upon all flesh, Joel ii. 28.

In his resurrection soul became deified, and body became glorified; he ascended to heaven with glorified body and glorified mind, to sit for evermore at the right hand of God, Mark xvi. 19. Heb. x. 12.

As Christ's body was laid in a grave, in which no man had before lain (John xix. 41); so his death was one through which no man had ever before passed; it was a death peculiar to himself, and in rising from that death, he became the first fruits of them that slept, 1 Cor. xv. 20. He died as the Son

of man, Mary being his mother; he was raised from the dead as the Son of God, God being his father; and it is Christ who liveth, and was dead and is alive for evermore, who has the keys of hades and of death (Rev. 1. 18). He ascended to his father and to our father, to his God and to our God (John xx. 17), and gave gifts unto men (Ps. lxviii. 18), that where he is in spirit, we, all his creatures, ultimately may be also, John xvii. 24. Herein the wisdom of God is love to the world: for Christ is the power and wisdom of God (1 Cor. i. 24), and is our righteousness and sanctification (1 Cor. ii. 30, Jer. xxii. 6), the Saviour of all men but especially of them who believe, 1 Tim. iv. 10.

The specially saved of God are his elect ones (Is. lxii. 12), whether Jews or Gentiles, for they were redeemed from among men and nations as the first fruits unto God and to the Lamb, Rev. v. 9, xiv. 4. They are the true Israel of God, the leaven that ultimately leaveneth the whole lump of humanity, and are they who are kept by the power of God through the faith of Christ unto salvation and glory, 1 Peter i. 5.

The love of God is manifested by the whole work of him, the Righteous one, the Prince of peace (Is. ix, 6), the only true God and eternal life (1 John v. 20), who declared, because I live, ye shall live also (John xiv, 19,); He did the will of God who sent him, and finished his work (John iv, 34), even the works of his heavenly father, John ix. 4, xvii. 4.

(To be continued.)

A LITERARY EVENING WITH THE REV. DR. THOM OF LIVERPOOL.

BY A DOCTOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HEIDELBERG.

The winter evening closes in. Sigismund, my friend, is with me: we are looking silently into the depths of the red-coal fire, for the fanciful faces of the wild and the grotesque; and our German meerschaums, now smoked out, are lying on the stand before us. Two strokes on the door knocker, and a quick departing step—it is the postman! the bearer of a letter with a Chinese device. I break, and read.— Sigismund, old college friend, cast aside thy grim reveries —see no more faces of the grotesque from out the live coals of my fire; here is an invite from our friend Dr. Thom. One evening, dear Sigismund, with such a man, is worth myriads of nights with your world's witlings; so speed the time till then, then to be most repaid. The interim has flown; and we, —that is to say, Sigismund (pure lover with a worship true of the great and good wherever found) and myself—stand within the garden gate of 3, St. Mary's Place. *Open Sesame*, hall door, and door of parlour, and, the centre of a group of eager listeners, we come at once upon the Doctor; an elderly man, say in years about fifty; in height, slightly above the middle; in figure, moderately spare; and in face, bearing a striking resemblance to the late Sir Walter Scott. A forehead, strikingly bold and well developed; high, broad, and full; disfigured, however, most abominably, by an execrable old scratch, red Welch wig, or rather brown George, put on we should say without the slightest reference to back or front; and which said antiquated peruke, we are necessitated to believe, the Doctor must have picked up in the purlieus of rag fair. O that a head so great should be imprisoned in a wig so vile! The eye though! well said Lavater, that it was the window of the soul. It is so here indeed! A light, keen, sparkling grey, ever shifting, never at rest—fitful as a summer breeze; a nervous eye—most nervous, falling before you, with an odd kind of abashment when you try to meet it, and felt to be probing you, and searching down into

the chambers of your spirit, when your glance is averted from it. But softly, and while we are sipping our coffee, made and poured out by the hands of the Doctor's amiable lady, let us reconnoitre the group around us.

There are many around; but there are three, that it would be *unpardonable* to pass. Look at that tall, gaunt, sun-burnt, man; straight as a dart—flexible as a bow—slender as a reed; unlicked looking as a backwoodsman, and supple as a king's wrestler; sparing of speech as an oracle, and as more than an oracle gifted. That is Emerson, the transcendentalist. He has been lecturing to the members of the Roscoe club (now broken up, for this is nigh four years back); and has now come to sup with Dr. Thom, prior to his departure for America; his sentences are jerked out; his tone is monotonous in the extreme; but the twilight of heaven is in his eye, and his words are as "*apples of gold, set in baskets of silver.*"

Observe yon pale, thoughtful, quiet personage, with voice low and gentle, and converse high as with the gods.—"O! broad, globe-like, massive forehead, stored with tomes of thought; what working brain is chronicled within thee?" —That of Philip James Bailey. The author of *Festus* stands revealed!

And, who is that exceedingly pompous, but exceeding gentlemanly man, who talks so loud, and so nasally, and takes snuff, direct from *Taddies*, out of those two immense boxes;—a most aristocratic handsome man in appearance indeed! —a princely autocrat with a fine old officer-like air with him that stamps him with a most courtly impress; forehead high and pyramic; hair and whiskers white and silvery; and converse, elegant and well-read? That is Edwin Atherstone the poet, the author of *The Fall of Nineveh*, a poem, which in so far as mere painting and beautiful colouring is concerned, stands almost unsurpassed.

But stay, yet once more, what elderly gentleman is that who is now speaking to Dr. Thom, with curly grey hair, stooping gait, white cravat, and the most benevolent air that it is possible to conceive. If ever the milk of human kindness does indeed flow, in angel channel, through the midst of human soul, we cannot resist, as we gaze upon him, feeling certain, most certain, that it flows free and full, and meandering, through the entirety of the heart, to which that face belongeth.—Whose face is it? That of Principal McHveen, of the Lower School of the Liverpool Mechanics' Institution. And of what is he speaking? Upon human nature! he is the champion of the humanities—he is telling what God made man—but, somewhat, says he, "lower than the angels," and he is urging, what God's boundless love may *yet* do, for the first fruits of his creation; that life is an education designed to renovate, ultimately, and that man, shall in the end, come out like gold tried in the fire. We say not that we are with him, nor do we assert the converse; but whether or not, his philanthropy and benevolence is undoubted.

But our honoured host, were he longer forgotten, "*it were as a gap in our great feast and all things unbecoming.*"—Dr. Thom shines in the pulpit; he is without doubt the finest analytic and exegetical preacher that we have ever heard. Yet, when we see him *here*, the vesper-star of the domestic and the literary circle, we are tempted to believe that he shines even still more, though with another kind of radiance.

Kind, nay affectionately so, he puts everyone at perfect ease in a moment—and, with the nicest and most delicate consideration, his sole aim seems to be, to elicit the peculiar talent of each, be it what it may.—"You Sir, are a Conchologist, let us ramble upon the shore together"—"a geologist, you my friend, let us delve into the marls and stratas"—ah! "and you are a poet too; your latest song, I pray, and what of Tait and Bentley"? So in effect says the Doctor to each of his guests, adapting himself with a most rare felicity to the peculiar talent of each, guaging as it were intuitively each one's mind, and *not* "fooling" it, but exhibiting it most advantageously, to the top of its bent. By so doing, Dr. Thom causes as it were, each of his guests, to be *in love with each*, merging

himself, in intent, but only to glow with a brighter, though most self unconscious light; this, in an host, is a most rare quality to meet with, and Dr. Thom possesses it to a most remarkable extent, in fact it is characteristic of the man; and by this most happy knack of action on his part, he makes each of his guests feel as if the entertainment had been given and got up expressly on his, or her, account: nor is it on high, literary, and scientific subjects only, that he can elicit the sense of each; he can *descend*, nay, such is his good nature, and so manifestly great his desire to make each at ease, with each, and with himself, that we firmly believe, that if a fishmonger were present, the Doctor would have from him the full price current of haddock, mackerel and turbot, and the state of the Billingsgate market. No courtly grandee, in a word, no fine old nobleman of a bygone school, could more completely do the honours of his castle, than does Dr. Thom go through the ceremonies of 3, St. Mary's Place. What is this? the tray! yes! for even Philosophers must eat, and the best of poets, are not chameleons. What! oyster patties? yes, even so, and cheesecakes dainty enough to tempt an anchorite with: tongue too! a work of supererogation that! for we have had the best all evening; a little honey, nuts, and almonds also? yea! and washed down with a goodly vintage! But hark! the chimes of Edgehill church are ringing twelve, and we have a duty to perform. It is Dr. Thom's birthday! we must drink his health! Principal McHveen says that I am to propose it. I speak feebly and hurriedly, something I know not what, for my spirit is stirred within me, and my heart is in my mouth, and the tears are in my eyes. But, I know what I *wish*, if I know not what I speak, "Health! Health! In body, soul, and spirit, to one of the great good men of God's creation, and each future birthday happier than the last.

It is over: our *nox "ambrosianæ"* hath ended!! Sigismund and I, are home again. And, hark! Sigismund, dear friend, a *word of words*, in your ear, "We will no longer look for shadows in the sea-coal fire, for their are warm hearts in the world *yet*, and the age of intellects has *not* departed."

Liverpool, December 18th, 1850.

Wednesday Night.

OF THE USE OF PASTORAL IMAGES IN THE FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE OF SCRIPTURE.

Continued from Page 204.

In continuation of the subject of the use of pastoral images in the figurative language of Scripture, according to our promise as given in the last September number, it is intended to enter into some more minute particulars respecting pastoral life in general with its various circumstances, as typically used in Scripture; to exhibit some slight views of that life such as it was and still is in the East; and also to make some farther reference to the typical character of the natural sheep.

There are certain conditions of the shepherd's life, not only in the East, but in most continental countries which never can have come under the observation of such persons as have had no experience beyond our British Islands; in which protected regions, though there may be many extensive sheep walks, there can be none which are infested by savage beasts—none in which the shepherd is liable to fight to the death for his sheep, or in which the sheep are in actual peril of their lives whilst seeking their daily sustenance.

It needeth to go beyond the sea-girt shores of Britain to form by experience

any correct ideas of the habits and dangers of the shepherd and his flock, in countries yet uncultivated where there are immense tracts of waste land and deep forest coverts, where it is impossible to protect the pasture grounds on all sides from beasts of these deserts and the coverts of these forests—where the shepherd must be not only a watcher but a warrior, and where, in the faithful pursuit of his calling, he must not only oftentimes peril his life but endure perpetually all those sufferings so pathetically described by Jacob in his address to Laban, Thus I was—In the day the drought consumed me and the frost by night, Gen. xxxi. 40. In his wanderings, the pastor must sometimes encounter those frozen blasts, which, passing over the fields of eternal snow, in some Alpine eminence above the clouds, rush down the gullies of the mountains into his pastures, freezing the brooks and streams in their passage and turning them as it were into stone; and, again, he must be parched and dried up with the burning breath of the deserts of the south—a slender tent, a den or cave in the dust, or the shadow of a rock, being his best temporary residence, whilst his food and clothing must be uncertain and scant as those of him "*Whose garment was of camel's hair, and his meat locusts and wild honey,*" his life in no way resembling that of the shepherd of the Arcadian fancy—which in very truth might better fit the condition of those shepherds of Israel to whom woe is proclaimed in Ezekiel xxxiv, because they feed themselves and do not feed their flock; the whole existence of the shepherd being one exercise of anxiety for the preservation of his sheep—of which the best that can be said is, that they know his voice, and when they hear it that they follow him, for so he teaches them to acknowledge him though not so as he knoweth them, for the shepherd knows all his sheep individually and cares for those especially which are most in need.—Luke xv. 4—6.

The instrument with which the shepherd rules and defends his flock is that which is commonly called the crook, the figure of which is adopted and used universally in the formularies of the great Anti-christian hierarchy. Who has not heard of the pastoral staff?

The ideal meaning of this word staff or rod, in its largest sense, is an extension of power; the length of the rod being added to that of the arm, extending the power and influence of that arm by the length of the rod itself. The figurative signification of this natural object depends upon the character of the hand that wields it, and according to this nature is the translation given in many instances, as that of sceptre when it is placed in the hand of a king, that of rod of correction in the hands of a magistrate, that of an extension of a family when spoken of a son or descendant of such family, &c.; and when applied to pastoral images, being no other than the shepherd's staff or crook as is proved in several pasages, especially in Psalm. xxiii. 4, "*Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death*"—"*thy rod and thy staff they comfort me;*" and again Micah vii. 14, "*Feed thy people with thy rod, the flock of thine heritage which dwell solitarily in the wood in the midst of Carmel &c.*

As it behoved the Lord the Saviour in his Divine and human nature to fill all space, so is he the antitype of every beautiful and desirable type, and hence in our view of pastoral imagery we find him as the *rod* or *crook*, or as it were the created instrument in his own hands; as the shepherd, the uncreated or divine

essence. In the shepherd's tent we find a figure denoting the wandering, unsettled and very uncertain nature of the shepherd's life, extending to that of the life of every man in the flesh, not excepting that assumed by our Lord, as saith Isaiah xxxviii 12, "*Mine age is departed and is removed from me as a shepherd's tent:*" neither is there any doubt, were there leisure to pursue the subject, that there is no particularity in the accustomed mode of the shepherd's life which might not be used with advantage in helping the apprehension of this same subject in a spiritual point of view. That our Lord is the true shepherd there can be no dispute amongst Christian men, his own declaration being sufficient to set the matter at rest at once and for ever; and that he is the Pastor of all the human race, which shall hereafter be as one fold under himself, the one shepherd, is also declared. Yet it is certain that the extension of his rule as a shepherd does not now appear, and in fact is not understood to exist at all, by any of those men who are of the world and only of the world. Of these many doubt the very existence of any flock of the Saviour's keeping; and we, as believers, are also taught that this flock is very small, and has been so and shall continue to be so till the time of the further manifestation of the true shepherd shall arrive. On this point there can be no question; for there is not now and never has been any time or place in which the true sheep of his flock (that is those whom he has marked with his own signet) could gather together, nor even can be, until their covenant head, their chief shepherd shall appear—notwithstanding which—that is, this discouraging view of the case at this and at all times of the present dispensation, there is no order of figures, taken from natural things which by their use in the spiritual language of Scripture gives more glowing, more overpowering, more extensive assurances of the divine love than the one under present consideration; the subject beginning as it were with the most touching instances of individual love, as in Isaiah. xl 11, and going on to such expressions as could not, it might be thought, be limited or made exclusive by any ingenuity which could be used by those most incapable of admitting any enlarged ideas of divine love. Let us refer to Ezekiel xxxiv, which whole chapter speaks of the dealings of the chief shepherd with his flock and with those who rule among them as inferior shepherds; or rather as persons taking upon themselves to act as representatives of the chief shepherd, in which chapter, as if it were to silence the scoffer for ever, this expression is used in the last verse, "*And ye my flock, the flock of my pasture are* MEN *and I am your God saith the Lord God.*" Ezek. xxxiv. 31.

Observe again what David says, Ps. xcv. and c. in which last especially, all nations are called upon to make a joyful noise unto the Lord, that is, because they with all of us are his people and the sheep of his pasture. Isaiah also says chap. liii. in speaking of his fellow men, "*All we like sheep have gone astray,*" &c. If more were wanting to prove, who are meant by the flock in the largest sense, we need only consult many passages in the New Testament and especially the latter part of the 10th. of St. John.

It must however be carefully observed, that although there is full assurance from Scripture that all mankind will be ultimately admitted as members of one flock under one shepherd (else how would God be all in all?) yet that they are not so now—there not being a place on earth, as there never has been a time

since the Apostolic age, in which there has been more than two or three as it were met together in the name of the Lord Jesus; and the reason of this is that the little flock on earth now in this present day has no visible head, therefore as the prophet writes, Ezek. xxxiv. 5, 6, *And they were scattered because there is no shepherd; and they became meat to all the beasts of the field, when they were scattered. My sheep wandered through all the mountains and upon every high hill: yea my flock was scattered upon all the face of the earth, and none did search or seek after them.*

But in order to do justice to this subject of the use of pastoral images in Scripture the discussion should rather extend over volumes than a few sheets, for if we have touched a few of the most important points we have done justice to no one of them, not even such justice as we could have done with more space: and others there are, to which we have not even alluded. One of these is the distinction between the goat and the sheep, both of which creatures, as victims under the Mosaic ritual, typified our Lord, and therefore neither of them is naturally significant of what is evil, though when both appear in Matt. xxv. the one is excluded from and the other admitted into the kingdom of heaven until the end of the age of that kingdom, a difficulty, which with some others, has already given way under the examination of a certain class of types which bear, though somewhat indirectly, on our present subject.

We here conclude with this humble petition in behalf of that little flock, of which we trust that some of us at least are the members through the favour of that Lamb who now stands on Mount Sion, that we may not be permitted to mingle with those of our brethren in the flesh who thrust with side and with shoulder, and at the diseased, with horns; but ever be as those with whom our Shepherd has made a covenant of peace, and so shall we dwell safely in the wilderness and sleep in the woods.

M. M. S.

A STORY OF GRACE.

CHAPTER I.

The family of the Richardsons was the most ancient in the town of B——. The old house, which for many generations had been known as their residence, well represented to the eye, with its gables and antique window-casements, what the name of Richardson conveyed to the ear. There was antiquity in both: and in both, the present James Richardson cherished a pride and satisfaction which it was very natural to entertain. Who would ridicule him for attachment to a home with which time had entwined so many interesting associations? and who would chide him for partiality to a name untarnished by dishonour, and brightened by a thousand kind and generous actions?

Like his ancestors, Mr. Richardson was a tradesman, and carried on an old established business by which he was enabled to bring up his family respectably, and provide for them a more liberal education than most people moving in a similar sphere cared to do.

At the time our narrative commences, the elder son had been long enough in his father's employment to prove a valuable assistance; and the younger,

who was just leaving home to be placed in a house of business in London, was the object of unusual parental solicitude, lest he should be led astray by the temptations to which he might be exposed, ungnarded by those wholesome restraints, and unaided by the good example which home supplied. George, now a youth of fifteen, was not wanting in respect for his parents, and appreciated the anxious interest they manifested in his behalf.

Mr. Weldon, the party to whom he was to be apprenticed, was slightly known to his father, and by the high recommendation of a mutual friend, he readily placed confidence in him; and, at the appointed time, he accompanied his son to his new situation; nor did he part from him without affectionately reminding him of those wise counsels he had been exhorted to follow.

Mr. Weldon was a man of integrity; but so absorbed was he in his business that he found little time for the cultivation of his mind; and, though a member of the Christian society, meeting at the Tabernacle, Moorfields, recently formed by that remarkable individual, the Rev. George Whitfield, his regular attendance in his place on Sunday, and at the communion once a month, was all the manifested sympathy he had for the church to which he belonged. We would not say that he was deficient in Christian principle, but it did not assume that form, which, in the eyes of his fellow members, consistency with his profession required.

Mr. Richardson requested Mr. Weldon to take his son with him to his place of worship, without thinking it of consequence to ask him of what persuasion he might be; and accordingly George accompanied his master to hear the great preacher. Hitherto he had troubled himself but little about religion; he had been trained to venerate the Church, and might be said to *imitate* his father in the decent observance of those duties which sufficed to satisfy the requirements of their religion.

It is not necessary to narrate all that subsequently transpired between this period and the time when George began to think and judge for himself, as one personally interested in the subject of religion. He pleased his master, and was comfortable in his situation; and his friends were gratified by intelligence of his well-being, and by his occasional visits amongst them.

The period of apprenticeship was rapidly drawing to a close; and George was anticipating manhood, independence, and self-support.

Mr. Weldon had for some time observed an unusual seriousness in his young assistant, and was glad of an opportunity which ere long presented itself, of enquiring into the cause of it. George was naturally open-hearted, and did not hesitate to admit that he had latterly lost that vivacity and buoyancy of spirit which had distinguished his character; and acknowledged that the subject of religion was the cause of perplexity and anxiety. He had recently heard a sermon which had had the effect of making him feel how ignorant he was of that which now appeared to him of the greatest importance; and he appealed to his master for advice and guidance.

It would be unjust to say that Mr. Weldon had no sympathy whatever for a person in George's state of mind; but the absorbing nature of his business, engrossing the multitude of his waking thoughts, unfitted him for the position in which he found himself suddenly placed. Feeling awkward and perplexed,

he resolved as most convenient under the circumstances, to refer the case to one of the officers of the Society. He therefore proposed to the young man an interview with one of the deacons, and kindly recommending the study of the Word of God, and private prayer, terminated the conversation.

Some weeks elapsed before the interview took place, during which time George failed not diligently and prayerfully to read the Word of God. It is not surprising that one great source of inquietude was the impression produced by those urgent appeals, those vivid representations of the dreadful condition in which man is placed by the corruption of his nature and his actual transgression against God's holy law; and the tremendous consequences in which all was to issue in a future world. Frightful were the pictures which had been presented to his mind; and while they filled him with alarm, he felt at a loss to reconcile them with the character of God, which the preacher as well as the Scriptures declared was love and pity to the guilty and the lost.

The first interview was followed by others at no distant intervals; and, at length, George was proposed for membership in the Whitfield Society. He had, according to the report of the worthy deacon, become "hopefully converted," and "a new creature in Christ," and according to the testimony of his master, he had "become himself again." In truth George had gone through a great deal; and it was a slow and laborious process by which he had at length attained a sort of conviction that he was of that little flock which God had exclusively loved from all eternity, and for which Christ had shed his blood. And tremblingly did he taste the consolation which he was told it was now his privilege to partake. Had it not been for a kind and benevolent heart—a prominent feature of the Richardson character—he might have grown indifferent to the condition of those who were supposed to be uninterested in the covenant mercy of God—who were shut up—not to the faith—but to the doom which their original depravity and consequent sins had assigned them.

His term of apprenticeship had expired; and, by the high recommendation of his late master, he had obtained a responsible situation in a house in the same line of business, but carrying on much more extensive transactions. Here he acquitted himself honourably and secured the confidence of the partners of the firm. It was George's delight to study the Word of God; and, as doctrines which were regarded as essential truths of that Word presented themselves more clearly to his mind, and as their mutual relation began to be perceived and gathered up into something like system, he was pleased when he could get the opportunity of conversing with the deacon who had had the interviews with him previous to his admission into the Tabernacle Society, and who had ever since taken a lively interest in his spiritual welfare.

Actuated by a sincere desire to live to the glory of God, he had become an honourable and active and useful member of the church to which he belonged; and had so far advanced in the acquirement and experience of the religious views which were current among them, as to be looked up to as an "established Christian." Considering how much there was in his adopted creed to depress, his consolation might be said to abound; and it was thought that he enjoyed as much of the light of God's countenance as was consistent with his personal safety! He was humble and simple; and without submitting his feelings to a

very strict analysis, he had as good a hope through grace as he thought it was the privilege of any uninspired man to enjoy.

But ere long his mind was to become the arena of another conflict. A circumstance was about to transpire in connection with the society which was to lead him to a thorough sifting of his present views and very materially affect his future course.

REVIEW.

Why is Popery Progressing? By David Thom, D.D. Ph.D. Second Edition. London: H. K. Lewis.

It comes not within our province, and it is not therefore incumbent upon us, as Universalists, to take part in the strife which is now agitating the mass of the people of this realm.

We cannot, however, but feel an interest in passing events which are more or less to influence and mould the future of men's minds, religious opinions, and ecclesiastical institutions; and gloomy and fearful as are the forebodings of the enemies of Rome, we are sanguine as to the good which sooner or later, under the all-wise and sovereign controul of the Almighty, will be evolved.

To get attention drawn to the subject of religion is good; and if, by means of the agitated waters of ecclesiastical commotion, they should be led to seek the side of the still waters of the sacred scriptures, there to see the calm placid reflection of eternal truth, an invaluable end will be secured.

Of the *brochure* which now claims our attention, and which first appeared some fifteen years ago, the well-known and justly-esteemed writer has now most opportunely published a second and cheap edition.

That popery has been making considerable advances in this country during the last quarter of a century, and progressing each year at an increased ratio is not denied by any party. But *why is popery progressing?* This is the question our author proposes to answer in his pamphlet. This is the question which, during the last few weeks, has been answered a thousand times and in almost as many different ways. An answer has been returned from the Vatican. Providence has been singularly indulgent!—England has been most mercifully dealt with; rarely has a country which has once been cut off on account of her sins been grafted into the good olive tree again. And his Holiness wonders at the amazing forbearance and goodness of the Almighty in achieving what has just been consummated on behalf of England, now restored to her orbit amongst the fair countries under the protection of the great head of the visible church.

Angrily and loudly do the anti-Roman-Catholic emancipationists announce the accomplishment of their predictions. It is just what they knew and said would happen! They foresaw it all, and they said so at the time. Cut down those parliamentary bulwarks of our protestant constitution, and what can you expect but to have the enemy coming in like a flood? alas! for the spurious liberality and truckling policy of a vacillating ministry!

Why is popery progressing? And who answers next? The party to whom attention is drawn by the last reply, to be sure. It is, of course, quite preposterous to suppose that the prime minister of England should have contemplated the fact upon which the question is raised, and which he will now answer forthwith. While he is careful to make known that his antipathy to the scarlet lady is extreme, he does not fear foreign aggression a bit, but he *will* answer the question (better let it alone, perhaps, we should have said had we happened to be of the cabinet) and what does he say? Traitors in the camp —unworthy sons of the church, with their intoning of prayers, their mummeries,

vestments, candles, auricular confession, &c.—dreadfully alarmed at this, and not at all to be wondered at that the Pope should, &c.

Ten thousand voices echo the reason assigned in the letter to the Bishop of Durham. The premier has struck the right note surely, and is not unhappy to find himself so well sustained!

But another reply is given even while we are considering what next, and this is specially addressed to the ear of the noble Lord, who is by this time well nigh overcome by his intoxicating popularity, and in accents loud enough for any one to hear who will listen. The answer comes from St. Barnabas, the edifice which the noble Lord had the satisfaction to assist in rearing, the edifice in which for seven long years the noble Lord has been accustomed to say "amen" to Mr. Bennett's "mutterings," in the support of whose institutions and peculiarities the noble Lord has, according to the Rev. Mr. Bennet, taken a lively interest. And what answer does Mr. Bennett return to our question? That the Reformed have gradually departed so far from the doctrines and practices of their own church, that dissatisfaction has been raised in the minds of many of the faithful who, since to restore the established system to purity seemed to them utterly impossible, have betaken themselves, for relief, to that "branch of Christ's Universal Church" of which his Holiness is the infallible head. That they should do so, is naturally very much to be deplored; and he would put a stop to such secessions by holding yet more tenaciously and practising yet more scrupulously all that the rubric, approves, enjoins, or allows. The premier may make the best he can of the disclosures of Mr. Bennett's letter. And so far from meriting the censure passed upon him, Mr. B. is entitled to the warmest thanks of England's church.

Other voices are ready to respond,—but enough. Let us now hear one who for many years has occupied a position from which he might take an impartial and comprehensive view of the whole question. To do him justice it would be necessary to quote at considerable length from his pages, but as this is impracticable on account of our limited space, we trust our readers will procure the pamphlet and read it for themselves. We will do no more than intimate what the Dr. most eloquently and forcibly maintains to be the greatest cause of the extension of the pope's power within these realms.

He points out and corrects the mistake which attributes to the Reformation that perfection and completeness which it were preposterous to expect. It was not likely that every error would be detected, and it was as unlikely that every truth would be discovered. The Reformers were men of like passions with ourselves, and would yet cling to principles and usages repugnant to the purity and simplicity of the doctrine of Christ. Our protestant contemporaries make a capital mistake in regarding the Reformation as the *ne plus ultra* of perfection.

In creeds, confessions, catechisms, and such like protestant defences, he points out a coincidence between the claimed infallibility of the pope and the self-asserted orthodoxy of protestants. The pope says—"dare to think or take a step farther than I prescribe, at your peril." Now if the creed means anything it means this too. No matter how diversified and contradictory of each other these creeds may be; each asserts, for his own, divine authority, and in this feature the family likeness is very strong.

> "Since they are only all agreed
> In damning one another's creed."

Our author further traces in the unscriptural practices of protestants—the performances of ceremonies, the services and offices, the observance of days and seasons, the priestly administration of ordinances, the ordination of bishops and ministers, &c., a vast amount of corruption and error, in all of which the essence of popery, and popery itself, find sanction and encouragement. And this not in the church of England only; dissenters and members of the establishment are both implicated.

To their less obvious origin and recondite first cause the Dr. then goes on to

trace those corrupt and earthly systems of religion, that sisterhood of harlots, of whom he regards the church of Rome not as the mother but the eldest sister,* of whose final overthrow the word of God abounds in unmistakable predictions. As temporary, external, and human, and consequently opposed to the spiritual and the divine, they must eventually perish. The prospect is animating. His hope is not in any human power; "to the word of the living God" he observes, "and to it alone do I look, for an effectual stop being put to the onward march of popery." This surely is the only ground upon which we may place any confidence; "the word of the Lord endureth for ever."

We heartily wish for this pamphlet a wide circulation. Let those who have the opportunity employ it in giving it distribution, and thus draw attention to a view of this all-absorbing subject which shall lead protestants to reflect whether they may not be doing more to promote popery than Pio Nono himself has it in is power to effect.

Z.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

Sir,—There are various points of view in which the same truth may be exhibited; and each is calculated to produce its effect on different minds. Those who reject salvation as the work of God, perfected in Christ crucified and raised from the dead—as a work wrought for us, (and *in* us who believe,) by infinite love; and with which the work of man, excepting as an instrumental or ministerial power, hath nothing to do—these, I say, create a hell of eternal torments for those whom they (in their Godlike charity!) are pleased to judge worthy of such a doom.

Now we would say to these, God manifests himself to man in the works of creation. For, as by analogy, the heavens and the earth that now are seen, are for a sign of that new heavens and new earth which is to be. Behold, then, this earth which we inhabit, as it rolls in mid space, surrounded by the vault of heaven, within which, as in the womb of a mother, it lives, and moves, and has its being! Behold these heavens, the symbol of the eternal glory, surrounding us on every side, as with the outstretched arms of the Almighty—and into which the earth *must fall*, if it fall from its sphere! Behold them, and say, Whither shall I go from thy Spirit, or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there! and if I make my bed in the grave (hell), behold, Thou, in the person of my Redeemer, art there! If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, (the image of death), even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy *right hand* shall support me.

Say, then, Christian-infidel, where is this hell of yours to which, in the pride of self-righteousness, you consign your brother? Is it in heaven, where love dwells? Or is it in the earth where sin dwells, and where you dwell? If in the earth, and in the earthy—which is to say in the carnal mind—will not God, the Judge of the World, when he shall come to destroy the earth, destroy this hell of yours, and fill the void with His presence, as with the spirit of love?

Hell is in the heart of those who, like to Cain, *hate* another—as Christ, in the power of the Holy Spirit, the spirit of divine love, dwells in all who love their neighbour as themselves. *Love*, that thinketh no evil, even *in death*, said,—Love all men, as I have loved you. Do this, and then shall even this earth, be as the kingdom of God and of his Christ; for the kingdom of God is the presence and the power of love.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
J. W.

P.S.—Will any of your readers inform me what advantage the Christian hath over the Jew, if Christ be not received *by faith*, as the Saviour of a world of sinners? For under the law it is written, we were shut up to faith. Are not, therefore, they who deny Christ to be the Saviour of the whole world, as in 1 John ii. 2, Judaizing Christians — the heretics, or Anti-Christs who should come? as in 1 Cor. xi, 19, 1 John ii, 18. This place of torment is said to be "outer darkness." And where is outer darkness? We answer —*Where God is not*—in the light of love, as seen in the face of Jesus Christ.

* We must refer the reader to his "Advertisement" for the Dr.'s matured views of the statements of Scripture on this subject.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01029 3738